

A Life for Language

A biographical memoir of Leonard Bloomfield

Robert A. Hall, Jr.

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

A LIFE FOR LANGUAGE

**AMSTERDAM STUDIES IN THE THEORY AND
HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC SCIENCE**

General Editor
E. F. KONRAD KOERNER
(University of Ottawa)

Series III - STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE SCIENCES

Advisory Editorial Board

Ranko Bugarski (Belgrade); Jean-Claude Chevalier (Paris)
H.H. Christmann (Tübingen); Boyd H. Davis (Charlotte, N.C.)
Rudolf Engler (Bern); Hans-Josef Niederehe (Trier)
R.H. Robins (London); Rosane Rocher (Philadelphia)
Vivian Salmon (Oxford); Aldo Scaglione (New York)

Volume 55

Robert A. Hall, Jr.

A Life for Language
A biographical memoir of Leonard Bloomfield

A LIFE FOR LANGUAGE
A BIOGRAPHICAL MEMOIR OF
LEONARD BLOOMFIELD

ROBERT A. HALL, Jr.
Cornell University

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM/PHILADELPHIA

1990

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Hall, Robert Anderson, 1911-

A life for language : a biographical memoir of Leonard Bloomfield / Robert A. Hall, Jr.

p. cm. -- (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series III, Studies in the history of the language sciences, ISSN 0304-0720; v. 55)
Includes bibliographical references (p.).

1. Bloomfield, Leonard, 1887-1949. 2. Linguists -- United States -- Biography. I. Title. II. Series.

P85.B565H35 1990

410'.92 -- dc20

[B]

89-28891

ISBN 90 272 4540 1 (Eur.)/1-55619-350-5 (US) (alk. paper)

CIP

© Copyright 1990 - John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

to J Milton Cowan and Charles F. Hockett

CONTENTS

Preface	ix
Biography of Leonard Bloomfield	
Chapter 1: The Early Years (1887-1909)	3
Chapter 2: Cincinnati and Illinois (1909-1921)	13
Chapter 3: Ohio State (1921-1927)	23
Chapter 4: Chicago (1927-1940)	39
Chapter 5: Yale (1940-1949)	67
Chapter 6: Posthumous Fortune	87
Notes to Chapters 1 to 6	95
References	101
A New Leonard Bloomfield Bibliography	105
Indices	
A. Index of Biographical Names	119
B. Index of Subjects, Terms, and Languages	125
Location of Illustrations	
Leonard Bloomfield at age 57	viii
Leonard Bloomfield in front of "Hotel Schwartz", Elkhart Lake, Wisconsin (c.1908)	2
Leonard Bloomfield playing a game of chess with a Dr Zinkin (c.1908) .	2
Facsimile of title page of <i>Introduction to the Study of Language</i> (1914) .	12
Leonard Bloomfield in his thirties	22
Facsimile of title page of <i>Language</i> (1933)	38



Leonard Bloomfield at age 57

PREFACE

One of the major intellectual advances made in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was the provision of a firm basis for the study of language in the science of linguistics. Leonard Bloomfield (1887-1949) was outstanding among the scholars most active in the achievement of this goal. Whether he was the most outstanding of all may be a matter of opinion. Is he to be rated above, say, William Dwight Whitney, Ferdinand de Saussure, Otto Jespersen, or Edward Sapir? Opinions may differ as to which of these was *primus inter pares*. In any case, Bloomfield must certainly be regarded as *par inter primos*.

The details of Bloomfield's life-history need to be better known, so that we may evaluate his achievement more fully. To date, they have not been as well known as they should have been, for at least two reasons. In the first place, he was very modest and shy, and this made it difficult to elicit from him very much in the way of personal reminiscences. Secondly, he downplayed the importance of the individual in contrast to the society in which he or she lives. Consequently, historians of linguistics have tended to view Bloomfield's life and character almost exclusively in the light of his published writings, especially in his 1933 book *Language*. His emphasis in most of his publications on a purely objective, scientific approach has led many critics to view him as having been cold, hard, and unfeeling.

It is to correct this view that I have undertaken the present — admittedly sketchy and incomplete — biography and personal memoir. It will be noticed that there is a great disproportion in length between the first two chapters (which deal with the first half of his life) and the remaining four. This discrepancy is due to the almost complete absence of detailed information, especially concerning his family and personal contacts, before he went to Ohio State University in 1921. When certain persons who might have furnished such information (e.g. his brother Grover or his adopted son James) were still alive, no-one seems to have thought of consulting them.

The "personal memoir" aspect of this biography is based on my contacts with Bloomfield, first when I was a graduate student at the University of Chicago in the 1930's, and then when I was a junior colleague of his at Yale in the 1940's. I had one course with him, in Gothic, in 1936, and saw him from

time to time in casual contact in Wieboldt Hall or the Classics Building at the University of Chicago. My wife Frances and I had dinner with the Bloomfields only once, in the summer of 1937, as narrated in Chapter 4. After Bloomfield had gone to New Haven in 1940, we saw him frequently at the meetings of the Yale Linguistics Club, to which we went regularly from Providence, Rhode Island. In 1943-1944, I was a Visiting Assistant Professor at Yale, in charge of the linguistic side of two Army programs involving Italian. During that year, I saw Bloomfield frequently at the University, and had lunch with him and other linguists several times a week.

For the information presented in this biography, I am, first of all, indebted to all who have already written on Bloomfield's life and work, particularly his friend and personal lawyer Léon M. Després, and his wife's sister-in-law Frances Clarke Sayers, in their articles in Hall (ed.) 1987 [see References to the Notes]. Especial thanks are due to the Archives of the University of Chicago for access to their files and permission to reprint the documents reproduced in Chapter 4, which cast a wholly new light on the relations between Bloomfield and the University administration (particularly Dean Richard P. McKeon) in the crucial year 1939. I am further indebted to the following persons who have aided and abetted me while I was preparing this biography:

Nicholas C. Bodman
J Milton Cowan
Peter F. Dembowski
Léon M. Després
Eric P. Hamp
Archibald A. Hill
Charles F. Hockett
E. F. Konrad Koerner

Norman A. McQuown
George J. Metcalf
Eugene A. Nida
Claire Després Oppenheim
Thomas A. Sebeok
Michael Silverstein
William C. Wimsatt
Sally Zimmermann

To all of these my heartiest thanks. Any blame for errors of fact or interpretation must, of course, be laid only at my door.

Ithaca, N.Y.
June, 1989.

R. A. H., Jr.

CHAPTER 1
THE EARLY YEARS
(1887-1909)



Leonard Bloomfield standing in front of the "Hotel Schwartz",
Elkart Lake, Wisconsin, owned and operated by his parents, Sigmund
and Carola Bloomfield



Leonard Bloomfield at a game of chess with a Dr Zinkin
(Both pictures taken in 1908 or 1909 by Elsa Wolfe; courtesy of
Leon M. Despres, Chicago)

CHAPTER 1

THE EARLY YEARS (1887-1909)

Leonard Bloomfield was born on April 1, 1887, at Chicago, Illinois, the son of Sigmund and Carola (Buber) Bloomfield. He was born into an Austrian-Jewish family, whose original name was Blumenfeld (later Anglicized to Bloomfield) and which had emigrated to America in 1868 from Bielitz (now Bielsko in Poland). Leonard's father Sigmund was the middle of three children. We do not know Sigmund's exact birth year, but it must clearly have been between 1856 and 1862. His brother Maurice (1855-1928) became one of the leading scholars of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in comparative Indo-European philology and Indic studies. Maurice was noted as a defender of the principle of regular sound-change; when one finds references to "Bloomfield" in this context, up to the 1930's, they are to Leonard's uncle Maurice. Under her married name of Fannie Bloomfield Zeisler (1863-1927), Sigmund's and Maurice's sister was an outstanding concert pianist. Her son Ernest Bloomfield Zeisler was an authority on the Haymarket riots of 1886-1887 and on the Sherlock Holmes stories of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. On the Buber side of the family, they were related to the philosopher and theologian Martin Buber (1865-1925), and on one side or the other, also to the pianist Moritz Rosenthal (1862-1946).

Little is known of Leonard Bloomfield's earliest years in Chicago. Presumably both German and English were spoken in his family. Leonard's English was completely native, with what he always referred to, in his discussions of English, as a Chicago phonology. Martin Joos, however, considered that it was a normal Wisconsin pronunciation. (In any case, the difference between the two varieties would have been very slight.) Bloomfield's German was extremely fluent, with a somewhat Austrian-tinged accent and an inimitable uvular trill for /r/. As with nineteenth-century Austrian Jews in general, no Yiddish was used in Leonard's family. Significantly, in his book *Language* and elsewhere, Leonard Bloomfield always referred to that

variety as *Judeo-German*, not as *Yiddish* (in marked contrast to the usage of others such as Edward Sapir [1884–1939]).

We do not know in what business Sigmund Bloomfield was engaged in Chicago before 1896. When the young Leonard was nine, his father moved his family to Elkhart Lake, Wisconsin, where he took over and ran the Hotel Schwartz. This was Leonard's official residence from 1896 to 1906, with the exception of the two winters of 1898–1899 and 1900–1901, spent in Europe with his family. The Hotel Schwartz was a resort hotel, with a main building (which included the dining-room and kitchen) and other houses and cottages on the grounds. According to reports, Sigmund was a bright, strong man, but his wife Carola did all the work connected with the operation of the hotel. Léon Després has described her as widely read, thoughtful, and intelligent. Like a great many other persons of German or Austrian origin, Sigmund Bloomfield was strongly pro-German during the First World War, at least until the United States became involved.

Leonard Bloomfield's parents were free-thinkers, in the tradition of the Austrian Jewish enlightenment. Consequently, their children received no instruction in the Jewish religion. In the operation of the Hotel Schwartz, they did not keep a kosher kitchen, and their guests included non-Jews as well as Jews. This absence of any but an ethical foundation for his beliefs may have been a factor in rendering the young Leonard defenceless against hostility, in any way except retreating into a protective shell of outwardly deadened sensitivity.

Bloomfield was very reticent on matters of religion, but was clearly agnostic, at the very least. On at least one occasion, I heard him remark "Wouldn't it be strange if, after we die, we should find that there really is an after-life, with a Heaven and a Hell?". When his wife Alice fell into a state of deep depression after leaving Chicago in 1940, well-meaning friends suggested that she join the local chapter of Hadassah and take part in its activities, but neither she nor her husband looked favorably on this suggestion. In such matters, Bloomfield's attitude was in marked contrast to that of Edward Sapir (1884–1939). (The latter, as is well known, was brought up in a strongly orthodox Jewish tradition, which he abandoned for a time, but towards which he returned towards the end of his life.) Bloomfield eventually substituted science (in his own particular view) for religion, and defended it

with a quasi-religious fervor in his writings. This was, however, in no wise a kind of “naïve scientism” on his part. He was fully aware of the relation between science, religion, and other types of attitudes, and of the choice between them being essentially a matter of faith. But he insisted that, no matter what one’s beliefs in such matters might be, one must never allow them to interfere with or distort one’s perception of the facts.

At Elkhart Lake, the Bloomfield children attended the local elementary school. It is said to have been a family joke that Leonard did not like the school there and at one point failed of promotion to a higher grade, perhaps because he disapproved of their teaching methods. This may well have been a typically Bloomfieldian way of concealing the unpleasant reality that, in his years in the Elkhart Lake school, he was badly out of place, as a bright but small, bespectacled Jewish boy from Chicago. The other boys — mostly German Lutheran — teased him unmercifully, calling him “April Fool” because of his birth-date and making him the butt of considerable nastiness.

There is an interesting parallel between Leonard Bloomfield and the German composer Johannes Brahms (1833-1896), in both their respective childhoods and their professional achievements. They both had very unpleasant experiences in their early years — Brahms in the lowest and most immoral slums of Hamburg, and Bloomfield in the school at Elkhart Lake — which left indelible psychic scars. Both grew up to become “classics”, each in his own field, achieving the highest degree of professional competence possible, but with considerable self-restriction in approach and technique. Both retreated from the onslaughts of the world around them into a many-layered shell of self-defence. Their ways of keeping the outer world at bay were, however, markedly different. Brahms became more and more gruff and bearish as he grew older. Bloomfield, on the other hand, was more and more shy as time went on, so that in the end it was next to impossible to draw him out on any purely personal matter at all.

Leonard had two siblings, an older brother named Grover and a considerably younger sister Marie, both of them brilliant persons. As for Leonard’s relations with Grover, the historian wonders whether they may have been such as to put the former still more on the defensive. The only anecdote known concerning the two comes from Léon Després:

[Leonard] said that his brother Grover was eating an apple. He watched Grover eat the apple, and was filled with a desire to have some too. It was a beautiful apple. Finally, he said quietly to Grover 'May I have a piece of the apple?'. Grover said to him, 'Since you asked me, no.'*

One such instance of course furnishes insufficient evidence on which to base any definitive conclusions as to Grover's having established, or tried to establish, any kind of psychological domination. Were there any other such instances? Was there any significant conflict or rivalry between the two? Léon Després tells us that Grover grew up to be an outstanding chemist. Did Leonard feel that, as a younger brother, he had (as many younger brothers often do) to prove himself Grover's equal or superior? We do not know.

Certainly, Leonard's experiences as a boy of elementary school age at Elkhart Lake were unpleasant, and it must have been clear that he needed to go elsewhere for high school. For this stage of his education, he was sent back in 1900 to Chicago, where he attended the North Division (now the Waller) School. His record in high school was spotty, averaging between B and C, with A's in German but with D's in French and physics. (In view of Leonard's later prowess in learning such a difficult language as Menominee, it seems strange that he should have done so poorly in French.) Nevertheless, his high school record was good enough to get him admitted to Harvard in 1903, with eight points additional for "advanced studies" and what would nowadays be called "advanced placement" in Greek and Latin.

In addition to intellectual ability, Leonard had marked artistic talents. It was rumored among the graduate students at the University of Chicago in the 1930's that a certain house in Chicago had, on the walls of its basement, some paintings by the youthful Leonard Bloomfield. These paintings, if they existed (as may well have been the case, given his artistic ability), must have dated from his years in high school. Léon Després reports that, in Bloomfield's undergraduate copy of Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*, Bloomfield had drawn very skillful and imaginative pictures in the margin. Many years later, he illustrated the original manuscript (which I have seen) of his elementary reading materials with similar drawings.

* Interestingly, in his 1933 book *Language*, Leonard used an apple as the object which Jill asks Jack for, in his simplified version of the function of language in transferring stimuli from one person to another.

At Harvard, Leonard's extra credits enabled him to finish his undergraduate studies in three years instead of the customary four, so that he obtained his A.B. there in 1906, at the age of nineteen. His scholastic record was definitely better, with no mark below B and with mostly A's. Among his teachers at Harvard, he most admired Charles Townsend Copeland (1860-1952), from whom he considered that he had learned not only to write effectively, but also to think clearly, through "Copey's" thorough and detailed criticism of his daily essays. (The results of "Copey's" teaching were evident in the mature Bloomfield's absolutely clear and concise style, saying exactly what he meant, no more and no less.) In his senior year, Bloomfield won the coveted Detur prize, receiving an edition of Tacitus as his award.

One would like to know more about Bloomfield's undergraduate years at Harvard. Who were his friends, how many were they, what were his major interests and his avocations (if any), and so forth? All his teachers and classmates are gone now, and virtually no information is available. The only indications I ever had came from one of his class-mates, William F. O'Reilly, who had gone to the (then newly acquired) American "island possession" of Puerto Rico after leaving Harvard, and whom I knew there in the late 1930's. All he said was that Bloomfield had been a brilliant lad, very studious and very shy. Now I regret that I did not "pump" Bill O'Reilly for a more detailed picture of Bloomfield as an undergraduate.

On completing his undergraduate study at Harvard in 1906, Bloomfield went on to graduate work, first at Wisconsin (1906-1908) and then at Chicago (1908-1909). In those days, it was by no means uncommon to complete the requirements for the doctorate in three years after receiving the A.B., even while serving as a teaching assistant. Normally, one put in two years on course-work and a third year devoted primarily to work on a dissertation. The latter was often quite short, by present day standards, sometimes only seventy-five pages or less (as was Bloomfield's dissertation in its printed form in *Modern Philology*), It was not uncommon to complete the dissertation while also taking courses and acting as a teaching assistant in one or more sections.

At Wisconsin, Bloomfield was a teaching assistant in German, in charge of two sections, each meeting four hours per week. He was not a degree candidate, and therefore never took an M.A. As a graduate student, however, he took ten courses in German and Germanic philology, as well as work in Old

Bulgarian, Lithuanian, Russian, and Sanskrit. Among his teachers were Alexander R. Hohlfield (1865-1935), Edwin G. Roedder (1873-1945), and Eduard Prokosch (1876-1938), all outstanding scholars in Germanic philology. The last-mentioned, who was nine years Bloomfield's senior, exerted an immediate and lasting influence on him. Bloomfield's description of their first meeting has become a *locus classicus*, and deserves to be quoted in full here:

[...] In the summer of 1906 I came, fresh out of college, to Madison, to be looked over for an assistantship. Desiring to earn an academic living, I had developed no understanding or inclination for any branch of science. The kindly Professor Hohlfield delegated Prokosch, one of his young instructors, to entertain me for the day. On a small table in Prokosch's dining room there stood a dozen technical books (I seem to remember that Leskien's Old Bulgarian grammar was among them) and in the interval before lunch Prokosch explained to me their use and content. By the time we sat down to the meal, a matter of perhaps fifteen minutes, I had decided that I should always work in linguistics. At the end of the two years of study that followed, I knew no greater intellectual pleasure than to listen to Prokosch.

In his year (four quarters) at Chicago, Bloomfield was again an assistant, presumably in German. He took courses in Germanic and Indo-European philology with Francis Asbury Wood (1859-1948) and Carl Darling Buck (1866-1955), and in German literature (the Romantic school) with Martin Schütze (1866-1950). (With the two last-mentioned, I had courses, twenty-five years later, in Indo-European and Goethe's *Faust*, respectively.) The topic of Bloomfield's Ph.D.dissertation was "A semasiologic differentiation in Germanic secondary ablaut", suggested to him and directed by Francis A. Wood. In view of the later wide-spread (but wholly inaccurate) canard that Bloomfield neglected or opposed the study of meaning in linguistics, it is worth noting that his very first work in the field involved semantic considerations.

Among the "summer complaints" (to use a New England term) at the Hotel Schwartz was the family of Chander Sayers, a well-to-do St. Louis business man of Lithuanian Jewish origin. Their daughter Alice is described by Léon Després as having been a "very strong woman", who "really set her mind on capturing Leonard". The latter, says Després, was "no match for her determination". Bloomfield passed his examination for the doctorate at Chicago, *magna cum laude*, on March 15, 1909, and married Alice Sayers three days later, on March 18.

We do not know exactly when Bloomfield made the translation of Gerhart Hauptmann's *Vor Sonnenaufgang* ("Before Sunrise") which appeared in 1909, his only publication in the field of literature. (In later years, he was by no means insensitive to literary values, but referred to them or discussed them in writing only rarely.) Nor do we know how early he began to collect the materials for his 1914 book *Introduction to the Study of Language*. Given their extent, he must have drawn on knowledge accumulated during his years as a graduate student or perhaps even earlier. His discussions with his uncle Maurice may well have begun at this time. Léon Després remembers Maurice Bloomfield's "coming to see Leonard once and being treated with great respect and surrounded with silence so that he might confer with Leonard". This latter event must have taken place on one of the occasions when the young Després was at the Hotel Schwartz, in the summer of 1919 or 1920, or thereafter; but the professional discussions between Maurice Bloomfield and his nephew Leonard must undoubtedly have begun much earlier.

In the spring of 1909, Leonard Bloomfield was ready to begin his academic career, which started that fall at the University of Cincinnati.

CHAPTER 2
CINCINNATI AND ILLINOIS
(1909-1921)

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE

BY

LEONARD BLOOMFIELD

*Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Comparative Philology and German
in the University of Illinois*



LONDON

G. BELL AND SONS, LTD

NEW YORK: HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

CHAPTER 2

CINCINNATI AND ILLINOIS (1909-1921)

For the academic year 1909-1910, Bloomfield was instructor in German at the University of Cincinnati. Of his colleagues during this year, the only one interested in linguistics seems to have been Claude M. Lotspeich (1880-1966), who was later a Signer of the Call for the foundation of the Linguistic Society of America. Bloomfield's earliest publications in linguistics consisted of a series of short articles and book-reviews in the Germanic field. Of these, only the first ("The *E* sounds in the language of Hans Sachs") was marked as submitted from the University of Cincinnati.

In 1910, Bloomfield moved to the University of Illinois, where he was, at first, Instructor in German as he had been at Cincinnati. William G. Moulton reports that Bloomfield told him:

The chairman of my department called me in one day and said that I was one of two instructors being considered for promotion, but that only one of us could be chosen. Though the department preferred me, they could not favor me over the other man because he had studied in Germany whereas I had not. If I would arrange to spend a year in Germany, they would promote me.

Accordingly, Bloomfield went to Germany in 1913. On his return to Illinois in 1914, he was promoted to Assistant Professor of Comparative Philology and German.

Another advantage which accrued from his passing the year 1913-1914 in Germany was that he was there while his book *An Introduction to the Study of Language*, which was accepted for publication by Henry Holt of New York in 1913, was going through the press. During the year at Cincinnati, and his first years at Illinois, he must have been working intensively on the book. The manuscript was received in New York in June of that year, as we know from a letter of his to Henry Holt & Co., dated the eighth of that month, in which he speaks of wanting to make some small corrections and requests that the orig-

inal be returned to him. The manuscript was sent to Germany to be printed by Teubner at Leipzig. Bloomfield's year in Germany was spent at Göttingen and Leipzig, where he would have had the opportunity of correcting the proofs of the *Introduction*. The book came out in 1914, but received little attention outside the United States, because of the outbreak of the 1914–1918 conflict. (Similarly, the *Cours de linguistique générale* of Ferdinand de Saussure [1857–1913] began to be influential only after the appearance of its second edition in 1922.)

In its over-all layout, the 1914 book is not dissimilar from Bloomfield's 1933 *Language*, which purported, in his view, to be simply a revision of the earlier work. After an introductory chapter on "The Nature and Origin of Language", there are five sections dealing with what would nowadays be termed its synchronic aspects, with one chapter apiece devoted to phonetics ("The Physical Basis of Language"), its 'mental' side, its forms, morphology, and syntax. There are only two chapters devoted to the diachronic side of language, the seventh on "internal [essentially structural] change" and the eighth on "external change" (basically involving the historical relations between dialects and standard languages). Bloomfield devoted a full chapter, the ninth, to "The Teaching of Languages", in which he sets forth, in virtually complete form, the basic principles which were and still are at the base of the improvements which were brought about during and after the work done in the United States' war effort in 1941–1945. A tenth chapter, "The Study of Language", deals with the history of linguistics, the best approach to the field for a beginner, and the relation of linguistics to other sciences (philology; literary history and criticism; history; ethnology; psychology; and philosophy).

The 1914 *Introduction* is a remarkable achievement for a man in his middle twenties. It is basically a *summa* of what was known about language at the time. It contains a fantastic amount of information drawn from over eighty languages and with numerous references, but (in contrast to his 1933 *Language*) with no basis in first-hand field work. In some respects, it was more in line than was his 1933 book with widely accepted ideas concerning language, especially with regard to psychology. In this respect, Bloomfield accepted the then dominant approach and used the terminology of the *Völkerpsychologie* of Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920), with its emphasis on the rôle of 'mental' factors in human use of language. He also assigned to the

individual speaker of a language a more important rôle than he tended to do at a later stage in his thinking.

Inevitably, the biographer and historian of linguistics is impelled to contrast Bloomfield's 1914 book with his "revision" of it in 1933. As we have just suggested, there are certain differences in his over-all approach to linguistic theory. In his presentation of the subject matter, also, Bloomfield's exposition became much more tightly compressed and integrated, so as to require much more careful attention, on the part of the reader, to every single sentence in the light of what has gone before. His style became extremely terse, with resultant sacrifice of easy comprehension on the part of the reader. In covering much more ground and in introducing many new aspects of linguistic analysis in the 1933 book, Bloomfield compressed and, in some instances, even omitted various valuable passages. Perhaps the most unfortunate of these excisions was that of Chapter IX, on the teaching of languages, which was replaced in 1933 by only a brief discussion of abstract considerations. This compression in the 1933 book was consonant with Bloomfield's growing inability to understand or show patience with ordinary people's slowness in grasping new concepts and changing their outlook as a result.

Perhaps the present writer may be forgiven for reproducing his comparison of Bloomfield and his achievement in 1914 and in 1933 with the *oeuvre* of certain composers:

If Bloomfield was like (say) J. S. Bach or Mozart in his inability to understand or adapt himself to lesser men's limitations, he was somewhat like Brahms in his growing self-restriction - in Bloomfield's case, to a model of scientific objectivity. But to arrive at a full estimate of Brahms, one should know, not only the rigorously classical, terse, and tense Fourth Symphony, but also the youthful, romantic *Requiem*. Not that Bloomfield's 1914 book is exactly "romantic", but it is imbued with the youthful enthusiasm of a budding genius who has just mastered the subject matter of his field and is eager to impart it to others.

At Leipzig, Bloomfield attended courses given by August Leskien (1840-1916) and Karl Brugmann (1849-1919) in Indo-European and by Hermann Oldenberg (1855-1920) in Vedic and Sanskrit. He can thus be considered as one of the last pupils of Leskien and Brugmann, and therefore as a direct link between the "Junggrammatiker" of the 1870's and American linguistics of the mid-twentieth century. Undoubtedly this contact would have strengthened Bloomfield's adherence to the "Neogrammarian hypothesis" (as he was wont

to term it) of regularity in sound-change, which had already been upheld by his uncle Maurice.

Even more important, however, was his contact with Jacob Wackernagel (1853-1938), who was at Göttingen from 1901 to 1915, because of the latter's influence with regard to the Sanskrit grammarian Pāṇini and his work on syntax. Bloomfield knew of Pāṇini before his Göttingen stay, as is shown by his mention of the Sanskrit grammarian together with the early Greek grammarians in the *Introduction*. This reference, however, does not suggest that Bloomfield was as yet under any strong Pāṇinean influence, and none is evident in his early writings. In 1919, however, he wrote to the Americanist Truman Michelson (1870-1938) that his models were "Pāṇini and the kind of work done in I.E. by my teacher, Professor Wackernagel of Basle" (which was where Wackernagel had begun and ended his career). This statement suggests strongly that it was during his Göttingen stay and his work with Wackernagel that Pāṇini became a major influence on Bloomfield's procedures in the analysis and formulation of linguistic phenomena. What he valued most in Pāṇini's method was its emphasis on precision and concision, although he recognized that on occasion it could lead to obscurity.

Bloomfield's application of a Pāṇinean type of linguistic analysis was evident first in his work on Tagalog, carried out at Illinois in 1914-1917, after his return from Germany. It has been suggested that he was able to devote time to this work because of the drastic decline in the study of German in the United States after this country became embroiled in the Initial Spasm (1914-1918) of the Thirty-One Years' War (1914-1945), so that he would have had fewer classes and more leisure for scholarship. Against this hypothesis, however, militates the fact that the products of Bloomfield's work on this language, in his *Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis*, is dated 1917, and that Frank R. Blake's review thereof was published in 1919. Even if we allow for a year or so's lateness with respect to these dates (so that the book might possibly have been delayed until 1918, and Blake's review until 1920), the actual work on Tagalog would still have had to be completed not later than 1917, or possibly even 1916.

The title of Bloomfield's *Tagalog Texts* is rather misleading. The texts themselves do not occupy more than approximately a quarter of the entire work. The longest section is that devoted to the grammatical analysis, with

subdivisions devoted to phonetics, syntax, and morphology. There is, finally, an exhaustive index of words, listed alphabetically by their roots. In the prefatory remarks to the discussion of grammar, Bloomfield says "The following grammatical analysis of Mr. Santiago's speech can of course lay no claim to completeness" (p.134). Here, too, Bloomfield is being excessively modest. In actuality, his analysis is not only complete in its exhaustive coverage of the texts themselves, but goes well beyond them in accounting for further data which his informant furnished.

For the material on which he based his work, Bloomfield relied on texts dictated to him by a native speaker of Tagalog, Antonio Viola Santiago, a student of architectural engineering at the University of Illinois, and taken down by Bloomfield in phonetic transcription exactly as he heard it. The analysis was the first example of a complete, thoroughly structural description performed in American linguistics. Unfortunately, since it deals with a Malayo-Polynesian language which is relatively little known outside of the Philippines, it has not attracted much attention from others than Austronesianists. Bloomfield's *Tagalog Texts* surely deserves John Wolff's characterization of it as "one of the great grammatical treatises of all time". Wolff's description of its characteristics is worth quoting *in extenso*:

The title hardly indicates the depth and thoroughness with which this work treats Tagalog: there are 50 printed pages of texts, from which every single feature of phonology, morphology and syntax is treated in the tradition of thorough-going grammatical analysis of inherited texts which philologists had developed in Europe in the last century [and which they had, in their turn, learned from their Indic predecessors -- RAHjr]. No form occurring in the text is left unexplained, either in terms of its internal make-up or in terms of the combinations into which it enters. Each point made is exemplified, usually many times over, and for each morphological formation described, a complete list of the forms occurring in the text which are subject to this formation is presented. This tradition of grammatical analysis of a given text in which no stone was left unturned was combined with active work with the person who produced the texts aimed at ascertaining the distributional features of all the recorded forms in terms of the entire language and not just in terms of what happened to occur in the texts. The result is a description of Tagalog which has never been surpassed for completeness, accuracy, and wealth of exemplification.

As so often happens, Bloomfield's pioneering work was not appreciated by specialists in the field. His *Tagalog Texts* was criticized, in a decidedly stick-in-the-mud fashion, by Frank R. Blake (1875-1962), of the Johns Hopkins University, in the only review that Bloomfield's book received.

Blake was unhappy about the avoidance of traditional grammatical categories (e.g., “noun” and “verb”) and of “logic” in Bloomfield’s analysis, without, of course, realizing that the inherited analysis of Indo-European languages was here irrelevant.

A later, perhaps more cogent, criticism of Bloomfield’s analysis of Tagalog is that his approach was still basically Wundtian from the point of view of the semantics of Tagalog morphology and syntax, with resultant vagueness in certain respects. Furthermore, in contrast to Bloomfield’s later work on the Algonquian languages, the Tagalog study was based on materials elicited from only one speaker. His analysis was, therefore, relatively free of the discrepancies and inconsistencies which inevitably beset any attempt to describe the “consensus” of usage in a speech community, even if the scholar does not try to set up an abstract *état de langue* which is supposedly represented in the utterances of all individual speakers. This problem was to beset Bloomfield later in his dealings with Menominee.

Nor was Bloomfield, in these years, so absorbed in his work on Tagalog as to be inactive in Indo-European, Germanic, and general linguistics. He joined the American Philological Association in 1914, and at two of the meetings read his papers on “Sentence and word” (1914) and “Subject and predicate” (1916). One of his most amusing discussions was devoted to the Middle High German word *physigunkus*, which in one context meant ‘a charlatan of learning, one who uses fraudulent erudition to deceive others’, and in another simply ‘an eccentric idiot’. In Bloomfield’s own time, a certain Leo Wiener (1862–1933), originally from Poland but by then established at Harvard, qualified as a “physigunkus” in the four volumes of his *Commentary to the Germanic Laws and Mediaeval Documents*, embodying a completely mad theory of “Arabico-Gothic culture”. Bloomfield’s strongly negative review of this work in 1915 earned him a violent attack from Wiener, to which (characteristically) he did not deign to reply.

During all these years, Bloomfield was of course teaching, probably both Indo-European comparative philology and elementary or intermediate German. It is likely that a great deal of the work which went into his *First German Book* of 1921 was done at Illinois, perhaps after the entry of the United States into the war in 1917. That event triggered a sudden and violent wave of hysterical

anti-Germanism. In linguistic matters, super-patriots attempted to eliminate German words from the language.*

Persons of German origin, especially teachers of that language, were placed in a difficult position, and were under strong pressure to take an anti-German stand. Even as early as this period, Bloomfield distanced himself from his surroundings. With regard to the war, he took a detached position and remained above the conflict. The Italianist Kenneth McKenzie (1870-1949), who was a colleague of Bloomfield's at Illinois at that time, told me (without going into detail) that this attitude had brought Bloomfield into considerable difficulty with faculty and students.

For these years, also, we have virtually no information concerning Bloomfield's personal life. His father died in 1919, and Leonard's brother Grover, who had become a chemist, returned to Elkhart Lake to run the Hotel Schwartz in 1919 and 1920. His sister Marie, who was much younger, went through elementary school at Elkhart Lake and, like Leonard, was sent away for high school training — in her case, to Milwaukee-Downer College (which, in those days, apparently had a high school division). When Leonard and Alice Bloomfield moved to Columbus, Ohio, in 1921, Marie was an undergraduate at Barnard College, Columbia University, where she was a member of the class of 1924, majoring in either economics or chemistry (reports differ).

One further stage (and perhaps the most important of all) in Bloomfield's professional development began before his move to Ohio State University in 1921: his descriptive and comparative study of the Algonquian languages. As shown by his correspondence with the Algonquianist Truman Michelson, which began in the summer of 1919, he had started to study materials dealing with those languages at least in that year or perhaps earlier. In addition to using printed sources, however, he wanted to do field-work and gather texts at first hand. His first trip to the Menominee reservation was in the summer of 1920, and his second was in 1921. It was relatively easy for him, with a pied-à-terre at Elkhart Lake, to visit the Menominee. This was the beginning of his involvement with not only Menominee (which remained the Algonquian tongue which he studied most extensively), but also Fox, Cree, and Ojibwa.

* Thus, *Hamburg Avenue* in Brooklyn was renamed *Wilson Avenue* (which it is still called), and it was decreed that *sauerkraut* should thenceforth be named *Liberty cabbage* (a term now happily forgotten).

After his first field trip, Bloomfield wrote to Professor Carl Haessler (of Wisconsin) on August 23, 1920, describing his experiences with the Menominee and his opinion of them and their culture:

Have been writing down Menominee words and stories. They are a delightful people, of good culture. It must have been an elaborate and beautiful culture 200 years ago. The European-American takes it away and reduces them to the level of our yokelry, under pretext of civilizing, — but it is just the good things of civilization — bath-tubs, telephones, freedom from bugs, good medical attendance, books, etc. — that they don't get. Determined effort to make them do the one kind of work of which the ordinary European yokel can conceive, farming — the one thing the M., with artistic temperament & inclination and no sense for "thrift", can never learn. Lived 2 weeks with a medicine man and his wife, lovely old people, & learned the cooking terms, etc., which have never been collected for any Algonquin language. They have been very kind to me & patient teaching me, & it was hard, as they don't speak English.

One wonders to what extent Bloomfield's evident bitterness against the European-American "local yokels" was an outgrowth of his resentment against the German Lutheran boys who had teased him unmercifully during his years in school at Elkhart Lake.

CHAPTER 3
OHIO STATE
(1921-1927)



Leonard Bloomfield in his thirties

CHAPTER 3

OHIO STATE (1921–1927)

The Bloomfields moved in the spring of 1921 from Urbana, Illinois, to Columbus, Ohio, where Leonard was to take up his new position as Professor of German and Linguistics. (He did not pass through the rank of associate professor.) It is not known whether they moved before or after his second field trip to the Menominee in that summer. His call to Ohio State was probably due to the influence of the chairman of the German department, Marshall Blakemore Evans (1874-1953), who had been at Wisconsin during Bloomfield's years as a graduate student there, and also to that of the classicist George Melville Bolling (see below). There seem to have been no prolonged absences from Columbus on Bloomfield's part during his years on the Ohio State faculty, except for one field trip (arranged through Edward Sapir) involving five weeks with the Cree Indians on the Sweet Grass reservation in Saskatchewan in the summer of 1925, and two trips to Europe in the summers of 1924 and 1926.

At Ohio State, Bloomfield had two colleagues who were of major importance in his later development: George Melville Bolling (1871-1963) of Classics, and Albert Paul Weiss (1879-1931), of Psychology. Bolling was a specialist in Greek, especially in the language of Homer. He was a pioneer in applying the findings of historical linguistics to the *vexata quaestio* of the authorship of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. In that debate, there were two opposing view-points among scholars, with the "Unitarians" maintaining that these two epics were composed by one and only one poet, and the "Separatists" holding that more than one author was involved. The extreme "Separatist" view was that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were pieces of folk poetry brought together at various times and places and assigned to one fictitious rhapsode. In this respect, the quarrel over the Homeric poems has had its counterpart in later discussions of the origins of the *Chanson de Roland* and other mediaeval Romance epics. Bolling worked backward from the

accepted “vulgate” text of the *Iliad* and, by analysing the characteristics of those lines marked as unauthentic (“athetized”) by Aristarchus and other Hellenistic critics, eliminated them and arrived at an earlier, shorter text which he considered as basically that which had been established in the time of the tyrant Pisistratus. His findings were summarized in three major books: *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (1925), *The Athetized Lines of the Iliad* (1944), and *Ilias Atheniensium* (1950). Bolling was closely associated with Bloomfield in the preparation for the founding of the Linguistic Society of America. He admired Bloomfield greatly, especially for the latter’s principle of basing the analysis of any given language on the categories inherent in its own structure, without the imposition of foreign models.

Albert P. Weiss was a leader in what has come to be known, rather misleadingly, as “behaviorism” in psychology. This movement, which is currently — 1989 — out of favor in dominant views of psychology, was initiated by a certain John Broadus Watson (1878-1958). Bloomfield was influenced, however, not by Watson but by Weiss. Although Bloomfield at first used the term *behaviorism*, he later switched to *physicalism* (after the usage of the Viennese school of positivists). A much better term than either of these would be *objectivism*, since this approach to psychology depends above all on objective study of what is observable or deducible from what people actually do (including what they say). Weiss’s mentor was the German psychologist Max Meyer (1873-1967), who set forth his approach in his book *The Psychology of the Other-One* (1921). Weiss and Bloomfield were close friends at Ohio State, and each influenced the other. In his 1914 *Introduction*, as we have seen, Bloomfield followed the then prevalent psychological theories of Wilhelm Wundt, with the assumption of a “mental”, non-physical factor in human actions, including the use of language. In the “objectivist” approach of Meyer and Weiss, “mentalism” was avoided, since they considered it unnecessary to assume a non-physical “mind” as a determining factor in human psychology.

Bloomfield came to share this position with regard to “mind”, so much so that he was eventually unable to interpret that term as referring to any kind of phenomenon except an undemonstrable non-physical entity. In the study of language, he reached the conclusion that it was not necessary for the linguist to belong to any particular school of psychology, since linguistics should be concerned with the facts of language in and for themselves. Weiss adopted

certain of Bloomfield's views, for instance that language functions in society in a manner parallel to the activity of the central nervous system of an advanced organism, and that mathematics is a derivative of language.

Bloomfield's friend, the psychologist Erwin Allen Esper (1895-1972), has left us a description of the personal interaction between himself, Bloomfield, Bolling and Weiss during those years at Ohio State:

[...] I came to see and hear a good deal of Bloomfield, although I was never his pupil. I might have become such if I had had more sense and had been less preoccupied with my work with Bolling and Weiss. Bloomfield invited me to his house and showed me his numerous files of Menominee material; the effect on me should have been like that of Prokosch on Bloomfield, but Bloomfield was so modest and therefore tentative in his manner, and I was so overawed by this brilliant scholar that the occasion was rather aborted; when we had lunch together on his patio, his asking me my opinions on some linguistic matters (and he was particularly concerned at the time about function words) increased my shyness and awkwardness. I have always regretted that episode; I think that Bloomfield's aversion to imposing himself on others could make him seem formidable, because of the contrast between his modesty and his obvious status as a scholar. My wife and I had dinner several times at the Bloomfields' and often met Mrs. Bloomfield, who decidedly was part of the picture; she was enormously protective of Bloomfield and resentful of any possible slight, however unintended or non-existent.

I should mention that in the psychology department shop we had a sawbuck table at which our staff, together with friends from other departments, had a sort of smorgasbord lunch every day. Bolling and Bloomfield were members of this group. I am sure that it was Bolling who was responsible for bringing Bloomfield to Ohio State from Illinois. [...] I think Bloomfield taught mostly German, including elementary German, at Ohio State; I doubt whether he had any advanced pupils who became linguists, although I haven't checked on that. At any rate, I don't think that either Bolling or Bloomfield were optimistic about the future of linguistics at Ohio State, and that was probably why he was ready to go to Chicago. [...]

At that sawbuck table, much of the planning for the first issues of *Language* took place. [...]

Bloomfield and Weiss were intimate friends; they were similar in their simplicity, humor, and general attitude. They and their wives often went on picnics together; Mrs. Weiss was a very gracious and unassuming person in whose company Mrs. Bloomfield had no need for belligerency; the same, for that matter, could be said of Weiss. Beginning in 1920 Weiss was an invalid, with heart trouble, so that the Bloomfields were frequent visitors at his home, where much of his work was done. Mrs. Weiss in a letter said that "it is a pity that a record could not have been made of their discussions". She said too that "about 1928 Albert and I spent the winter

quarter in Washington, D.C., and that year Dr. Bloomfield was East and spent a day or so with Albert; they were so busy talking that I even ordered their meals at the restaurant. I remember an occasion when Bloomfield and I were looking at a photograph of Max Meyer and Weiss. Bloomfield said, "There are perhaps two of the most important men of their time".

In February of 1923, after the Bloomfields had been at Columbus for a year and a half, tragedy struck. Marie Bloomfield had shown herself to be a brilliant student at Barnard, and had developed strong Bolshevist sympathies. On February 7, in a fit of depression, she committed suicide by taking cyanide. Her brother Leonard was notified of her suicide by Dean Virginia Gildersleeve of Barnard, and replied that he would go to New York for the interment, which he did. Marie was not the only member of the Bloomfield and Sayers families to manifest mental instability, though she was the only one to carry it as far as suicide. Her elder brother, Grover Bloomfield, had (according to Léon Després) an outstanding career as a chemist, until he suffered a psychological break-down and was on disability insurance for the rest of his life. Alice Bloomfield's mother, Mrs. Sayers, also had a complete breakdown and spent the last years of her life in and out of mental hospitals, in a state of complete or almost complete disassociation from her environment. Nor were the Bloomfield and Sayers families the only ones to manifest such (probably genetically determined) proneness to psychological instability. There were similar developments in the families of such geniuses as Sapir and Wittgenstein.

His sister's suicide was probably a further factor in Bloomfield's self-distancing from the emotional aspects of every-day life. It may also have contributed to his view of the individual's personal reactions as socially unimportant in contrast to what he viewed as the organism-like structure of society as a unit held together by language. It was impossible to draw Bloomfield out on such matters as the emotional aspects of music or literature. Only rarely did he give vent in print to personal feelings, and even then only concerning entire groups or societies, as in his outburst (that is not too strong a term) on the Menominee in the introduction to his *Menomini* Texts (1928):

The Menomini are rapidly being made over into the cultural type of the uneducated white American; if that European-American culture which, with its art and science, is worthy to stand beside their own and perhaps above it, they know nothing. They are suffering, therefore, what can be regarded only as a cultural loss, and they are fully aware of this, bearing it with a wistful resignation. The older Menomini are eloquent in their native speech, a very rich language that lends itself to elevated style and to the expressive refinement of a sensitive people. In addition, many of

them are fluent in Ojibwa or Potawatomi or both. Today many Menomini children speak only the feeble English dialect, a thousand times bastardized by the standard language, which they receive from ignorant school-teachers and from the inhabitants of the surrounding countryside. The contrast is even more tragic in other respects, which are beyond the scope of this book.

By the middle 1920's, there was a growing awareness among American scholars in the various branches of linguistics that there was need for a single organization whose meetings and publications could furnish a focus for a more unified approach to the field than had previously been available in the currently widely scattered channels of specialist societies and journals. Martin Joos reports that Bloomfield had been working on such a project in 1923, but that it was delayed for nearly a year after Marie's suicide. In 1924, a committee of three — Leonard Bloomfield, George M. Bolling, and Edgar H. Sturtevant (1874-1952) of Yale — prepared to send out a call for the foundation of the Linguistic Society of America. They obtained the signatures of twenty-six other sponsors, who were thenceforth known as Signers of the Call and honored with the special abbreviation SC opposite their names in the Society's membership lists. The Call was sent out as of November 15, 1924, and the organizational meeting of the Society was held in New York on December 28, 1924, with eighty-nine persons in attendance. Its first president was the Indo-Europeanist Hermann Collitz (1855-1935) of Johns Hopkins, with Carl Darling Buck of Chicago (1866-1955) as its first vice-president. As its secretary-treasurer, Roland Grubb Kent (1877-1952) served from 1924 to 1940. George M. Bolling was the first editor of the Society's journal *Language*, from 1924 until 1939. Maurice Bloomfield was president in 1926, Leonard Bloomfield in 1936.

The first article in *Language* (1.1-5 [1925]) is Leonard Bloomfield's "Why a Linguistic Society?". Starting with the (to him and other workers in the field) fairly obvious statement that linguistic science exists, he sets forth the various aspects of the study of language, descriptive and historical. He then enumerates the benefits which derive from the coming together of linguists in a single organization — to themselves, to the academic world, to anthropology (in the preservation of disappearing languages), and to the public at large. In this connection, the term *science* is particularly important. For fifty-one years, from 1925 through 1975, the masthead of the Society, in its journal *Language*, carried the sub-heading "founded 1924 for the advancement of the scientific study of language". In later years, some have queried the possibility of such

an approach to linguistics, e.g., the Austrian-born stylistician Leo Spitzer (1887-1960) and such Spitzerians as the late “Bennison Gray” (the husband-and-wife team J. Michael Gray and Barbara Bennison). Nevertheless, Bloomfield’s view of linguistics as a science — no matter how we interpret that term — has continued to predominate, largely through his and others’ work as published in the journal *Language*.

During his years at Ohio State, Bloomfield worked on the preparation of his *Menomini Texts*, which appeared in 1928, and therefore must have been completed in manuscript by 1927, the year he moved to Chicago. He also began comparative work on the reconstruction of what he termed “Proto-Central Algonquian”, on whose sound system he published a highly important article in the first volume of *Language* (1925), as well as some short notes on Fox. Other notes and reviews from Bloomfield’s pen (he never used a typewriter) appeared during this period on Germanic, Austronesian and Indic languages.

Bloomfield’s on-going interest in general linguistics was manifested in several reviews and articles. He reviewed Edward Sapir’s *Language* in 1922, the similarly named *Language* of Otto Jespersen (1860-1943) in 1924, and the second edition of Ferdinand de Saussure’s *Cours de linguistique générale* also in 1924. His review of Sapir was moderately favorable, that of Jespersen less so. Over Saussure’s *Cours* he waxed quite enthusiastic; at the end of his review he says “he has given us the theoretical basis for a science of human speech”. At a later date (in a letter addressed in 1945 to J Milton Cowan [b.1907]) Bloomfield says, à propos of Saussure, that his own 1933 book *Language* “reflects his *Cours* on every page”. This was an exaggeration, but it is nevertheless possible to discern the influence of Saussure’s approach in some facets of Bloomfield’s *Language*. (Or, rather, the approach of the quasi-Saussure, since, as is well known, the 1916 *Cours* was not written by Saussure himself, but was put together after his death by two of his former students and colleagues — Charles Bally [1865-1947], Albert Sechehaye [1870-1946] — and Albert Riedlinger [1883-1978], one of his students — from students’, especially Riedlinger’s, notes.) Not all of the quasi-Saussure’s influence on Bloomfield was beneficial, for instance with regard to the relation of the individual speaker to the speech-community; to the rigidity of the system from a strictly synchronic point of view; and to the irrelevance of phonetics to phonological structure.

A more general article, "On recent work in general linguistics" (1928, but obviously written before Bloomfield left Ohio State in 1927), treats a number of books published, not only in the 1920's, but as far back as Wilhelm von Humboldt's *Über die Kawi Sprache* (1836), Heymann Steinthal's *Charakteristik der hauptsächlichsten Typen des Sprachbaues* (1860), Max Müller's *Lectures on the Science of Language* (1861), and William Dwight Whitney's *Language and the Study of Language* (1867) and *The Life and Growth of Language* (1875). Bloomfield discusses them from eight points of view: underlying method, meaning, the phoneme, descriptive linguistics, "ecology" (use in society; dialect and standard language), phonemic change, the pathology of language, and applications. Bloomfield's concern with underlying method found its fullest and clearest expression in his ground-breaking and still fundamental article "A set of postulates for the science of language", in volume 2 of *Language* (1926). That it was reprinted in 1949 in the *International Journal of American Linguistics* in lieu of an obituary may be interpreted as an indication that many considered this to be Bloomfield's legacy. For clarity, precision, concision, and true rigor (not rigidity!), this article has no equals. In it, Bloomfield sets forth the basic assumptions on which his treatment of language in his 1933 book was founded, and on which all sound discussion of linguistic matters has rested ever since (with, of course, some further improvements).

One of Bloomfield's minor interests was Romany, the language of the Gypsies — probably because of its Indic origin. Frances Sayers tells how she and the Bloomfields were out one afternoon for an automobile-ride near Columbus, when they came across a camp of Gypsies:

Leonard was interested in knowing what language they spoke, so he parked the car, got out and began to talk to a man who approached him. In a moment more and more Gypsies were coming up to the two men, so the rest of us disembarked and joined the crowd. They were all excited to meet this man who knew the dialect they were speaking, some Romany-related language, and they were reluctant to have us leave.

An echo of this interest appears in Bloomfield's book *Language* of 1933, where he cites a sentence in Romany: /áj dównť kám tu dík e múš a čúmřn a grúvŋ/ 'I don't like to see a man a kissin' a cow'. It will be noted that the functors are all English and all the contentives are of obviously Indic origin:

/kám/ 'like', /dík/ 'see', /múš/ 'man', /čúmɾn/ 'kissing' and /grúvr/ 'cow'. On several occasions at Yale, I heard him repeat this sentence with vast amusement.

Even after his move to Ohio State, Bloomfield was still burdened (as he saw it) with the teaching of elementary German. His *First German Book* (for which, as we have suggested, much of the work may have been done at Illinois) was published at Columbus in 1923, with a second edition at New York in 1928. This book was and still is thought highly of, and was used, for example, by William and Jenni Moulton in the preparation of their *Spoken German* (1944). Nevertheless, Bloomfield clearly thought that his main "job" in life was to study languages and formulate their structures, and to work in general linguistics. At the end of a letter to Edward Sapir, dated June 3, 1923, Bloomfield said "It must be a blessing to work only at one's job, and not teach Freshman German for a living". Unfortunately, the type of (possibly even excessive) encouragement that the young Leonard had received in his family for his intellectual activities (as described by Léon Després), especially in their almost worshipful attitude towards his colloquies with his uncle Maurice, was by no means the best preparation for the normal demands of humdrum university life in the America of those days (and even of the present).

The letter to Sapir just mentioned was one of a series written between 1924 and 1925. The earlier letters in this correspondence deal with linguistic matters, especially American Indian languages (on which, by this time, both had worked extensively). The last ones of the series are concerned with plans and arrangements for Bloomfield's 1925 summer trip to Saskatchewan to work on Cree — a project which was financed by the Division of Anthropology of the Canadian Department of Mines, Ottawa. Both Sapir and Bloomfield attended the organizational meeting of the Linguistic Society on December 28, 1924, so they presumably met in person on that occasion, as well as at later meetings of the Society.

For Bloomfield's personal and family life, we begin to get more detailed information beginning with his Columbus years, thanks chiefly to the article "The small mythologies of Leonard Bloomfield", by Frances Clarke Sayers, the wife of Alice Bloomfield's brother Alfred Sayers. There are also scattered references in reminiscences furnished by others, such as the already cited recollections of Erwin Allen Esper, but our chief information comes from Mrs.

Sayers. Her essay is, in some respects, quite sentimental; but, in view of the widespread misconception of Bloomfield as having been cold, hard, and unfeeling, it is good to know that there were some aspects of his life that are worth being sentimental about.

All agree that Alice Sayers Bloomfield was very devoted to her husband, and very protective of him. Esper reports that this led, however, to her often being aggressive and "edgy", ready to defend him whenever she felt it necessary. Mrs. Sayers says "She was a buxom person, light-complexioned and gracious, but there was in her face an expression of aching anxiety which I had seen before in certain people who had from time to time lost touch with reality". Mrs. Bloomfield had a highly developed aesthetic sense, with a love for artistic work in paintings and antiques. Fortunately for their household finances, she had, Mrs. Sayers reports, "money of her own and thus was able to indulge her hobbies without putting undue strain on the family budget".

The Bloomfields seem to have been very fond of dogs. Mrs. Sayers describes Leonard's washing their large Irish setter Abdul in the basement of their house in Columbus, and making the dog wildly happy by talking to him in most unflattering terms, saying such things as "You are a dummkopf. You are not a bit of use and a great botheration", but in an extremely lyrical and tender tone of voice. Bloomfield was thereby demonstrating once more the well-known fact that dogs respond, not to the denotations of words in human language, but to the emotional connotations of intonation and voice-qualifiers. When my wife Frances and I had dinner at the Bloomfields' at Chicago in 1937, they had a pair of dachshunds to which they were clearly greatly attached.

Bloomfield was very fond of practical jokes, of a quiet kind. Mrs. Sayers tells how, on the first night she and her husband Alfred stayed at the Bloomfields at Columbus in 1935, they turned down the bed-covers and saw, walking in a stately row, five bed-bugs, which of course turned out to be made of tin. She had time to motion to her husband to be quiet and open the door, "and there was Leonard outside, waiting to hear the screams". I believe it was Bloomfield who told me, on some occasion at New Haven in the 1940's, a version of a similar story: Onkel Jakob and Tante Sara are on their first visit to their relatives in America. The children have put a row of bed-bugs on the sheets, and are waiting outside to hear Tante Sara shriek. Instead, they hear

Onkel Jakob shout angrily *Ach, diese verfluchten Amerikaner! Sogar die Wanzen sind künstlich!* ('Ach, these damned Americans! Even the bed-bugs are artificial!').

Bloomfield's humor was of the kind which might be described, it has always seemed to me, as that of the "quietly outrageous". Another story which, according to J Milton Cowan, Bloomfield liked to tell was that of the man who, at an elegant dinner, did all kinds of strange things, such as taking some mayonnaise on his fingers and "gauming" it into his hair. In response to his hostess's astonished expostulations, he excused himself by saying "Oh, I'm sorry! I thought this was spinach!"*.

Bloomfield also liked to give unexpected but biting characterizations of objects or behavior-patterns. On various occasions he described American "store-bread" as "cotton batting flavored with bismuth and arsenic and wrapped in artificial leather". On another occasion, he commented on the modern habit of "carrying around in one's pocket one or more pieces of cloth filled with dried nasal mucus". I replied that even that custom was better than eighteenth-century people's habit of blowing one's nose onto one's fingers and then wiping them off on one's clothes, and mentioned that certain European museums have articles of eighteenth-century clothing with dried *Nasenschleim* still adhering to them.

Another of Bloomfield's favorite stories was that of the creditor who was starting to write a dunning letter. His wife said to him "Now, Jakob, be sure to write a nice, courteous letter — none of your usual insulting language". When he finished the letter and showed it to her, she commented "Well, Jakob, this is a good, friendly letter. There are just a couple of mistakes in spelling. You don't write *dirty* with two *t*'s, and *cockroach* doesn't begin with a capital *K*." The last sentence has passed into the family-dialects of a number of persons who knew Bloomfield. It is worth observing, in passing, that virtually all of his pranks and stories of real or imaginary happenings reflected detachment from one's environment.

* Other versions of this story ascribed to Bloomfield involve potato salad instead of mayonnaise, or asparagus which the man pulled across his forehead and then said he thought it was broccoli.

The title of Mrs. Sayers' reminiscences, "The small mythologies of Leonard Bloomfield", derives from his habit of thinking up imaginary situations and names, for either real or fictitious persons. His nick-name for his wife was "Goodie", and he seems to have thought of the two of them as living in a nameless kingdom, in which she was "Queen Goodall" and he was, for some unknown reason, "Vestry the Lynx". On one occasion, the Bloomfields and the Sayerses amused themselves by improvising distiches about one Sigurd Jansen from Iceland, who was unhappy in warm climates because he could not keep cold enough. Among Leonard Bloomfield's contributions were:

Under the gleaming icicles
Sigurd Jansen serenely bicycles.

Of work his missus had no lack,
Shoving snow down Sigurd's back.

Sigurd Jansen's pet device
Was sleeping on a bed of ice.

Sigurd Jansen wore georgette,
But even then he'd pant and sweat.

One day they found that Sigurd Jansen
Went downtown without his pants on.

On another occasion, Bloomfield took a box in which his wife kept her chewing-gum as a point of departure for a reïnterpretation of the name of some neighbors of theirs, a Mr. and Mrs. Gumbin.

Bloomfield made trips to Europe in at least 1924 and 1926. On the first trip, he attended a congress at The Hague; on the second, one at Rome. In 1926, he and Goodie spent some time in a small town in the Puy-de-Dôme region, Saint-Nectaire, with an aunt of his, Wolle Buber, and her husband. In a letter to Mrs. Sayers, dated August 28, 1926, he indulges in whimsical fantasies concerning lynxes (presumably derived from some kind of Amerindian folklore) and gives an amusing account of their experiences in Saint-Nectaire:

Thank you for all the things you write to us, also about lynxes, but you must not believe all you hear or read. Ignorant people will say "There's a link on that tree" and go out and shoot a lynx, but that is only a bodily semblance & does not affect

the spiritual reality of underground & underwater lynxes, whose long tail wound round a woman's knees will draw her down into the deep, and there are few young women who can charm them up again & cut the tail that binds them & they will charge at least \$100. That is why my enemies never go on the water with young women. Even Fifield & Stephenson send me samples of shirts that are forwarded here, \$42 a dozen & I am sure they would not fit, if I had the money.

It is very nice for me to be with my Aunt Wolle & cousin here, but not so nice for Goodie, as there is nothing to do. & the hotel very primitive & on a noisy village street. The scenery is very beautiful, but my uncle can't walk much, my aunt walks very slowly, Goodie is afraid to let me walk (& I wouldn't like lying flat here for 2 weeks), so we don't see much of it, except in bus rides. Therefore, though I hate to part from my aunt & uncle, not knowing when I shall see them again, it will at least mean a little more fun for the Queeyen. She can do what she pleases in Italy, unless I oppose her from sheer force of habit.

At this hotel they serve every dish as a separate course, & in no particular order, e.g. (1) carrots (2) potatoes (3) meat (4) another meat (5) string beans. But it is really very good stuff.

In a letter from Rome, dated September 17, 1926, Bloomfield wrote Mrs. Sayers concerning their experiences there, including a paragraph making fun of some Italians' mangling of the English language:

[Goodie] and her staff went through the Vatican's Museum and Sistine Chapel today; they are so inconveniently laid out that merely to see each thing once she had to walk herself tired. Therefore she is going to beat up the Pope one of these days. [...]

Strangers wants' supplied with excellents English speaks guides services where-upon, our charges is exceptional lowness in consideration being exchanges, qualities of tours, etc., & supplies of luncheons (to exclusion of beer, wines & tip). Frequented pastry English aristocracy and Americans best public.

They kill the lynx,
They kill the lynx,
They kill the lynx,
They kill the lynx,
But I do not die;
Medicine of the lynx
The lynx gave me;
But I do not die.

Mrs. Bloomfield added:

Today when I went thru the catacombs of St. Calixtus (for the second time in 23 years) I said I'd never do [it] for anyone but Vestry and that I was to write a book

called *The Martyrdom of St. Alice* (martyrdom being the style here). Vestry said he'd write another called *The Campaigns of Queen Goodall*.

The morning of the 24th, Leonard reads two papers at the A[nthropological] Congress; we leave that afternoon for Naples and sail next morning. Some day, the 24th!

Bloomfield also mentions, in his book *Language*, having been in London, but it is not known whether it was in 1924, 1926, or on some other trip. Nor is it known whether he ever visited Germany again after his year there in 1913-1914.

The Bloomfields had no begotten children, and at some point of time in the early 1920's, they adopted two boys, Roger Montour Bloomfield and James Sheldon Bloomfield. Roger was, in Mrs. Sayers' words, a "half-abandoned boy", a kind of latter-day Huck Finn, whom they came across on the Menominee reservation and whom Mrs. Bloomfield wished to adopt. It may legitimately be doubted whether the ultra-studious Leonard and the determined, often imperious Goodie would have been suitable parents for any child who had not come to them as a baby, begotten or adopted, and had not grown up with them from infancy. There is no evidence that the Bloomfields had any guidance or supervision from any social work agency in the process of adoption. When he came to adolescence, Roger rebelled against what he must have perceived as Goodie's domineering ways (Mrs. Sayers reports that "Alice was inhibited in showing affection") and left the family. He said to Mrs. Sayers "Aunt Frances, I want to be like my father and end up a drunken bum", and she adds that this was "a goal which he eventually achieved". Like Huck Finn, he refused to let himself be "sivilized".

Their other adopted son, Jimmy, was younger than Roger, and came to the Bloomfields at a presumably earlier age. He had been in an orphanage, and Roger (who knew him in school) urged the Bloomfields to adopt him. According to Mrs. Sayers, he was more tractable and responsive to Leonard Bloomfield's type of affection and humor. She reports one conversation between Jimmy and Goodie in which, on learning that the Bloomfields' ancestors were Jewish and his were not, he said "If you and Vestry are Jews, so am I". Jimmy eventually joined the Navy and continued in it as an officer. He lived until 1986, dying at Chicago in a nursing home. Unfortunately, no one in linguistics seems to have kept up with his whereabouts, and thereby

(provided he had been willing to talk about the situation) many precious reminiscences of Goodie and Vestry were lost.

As a result of poor teaching in school, one or both of the Bloomfields' boys had difficulty in learning to read. This situation aroused Bloomfield's concern, so that he took time from his purely scholarly activities to prepare materials for teaching reading on the beginning level. These lessons followed a carefully designed order, in which first the more regular and predictable correlations between phoneme and grapheme (e.g. in *cat, hat, bat, sat* etc.) were presented and drilled, so that firm associations were set up in the learner before passing to the less regular correlations. Their content was, even in the earlier lessons, ingeniously planned to arouse the learner's interest (far more so than the *Look, look, Jane, Dick, Spot, oh, oh, look, look!* of the "see and say" texts) with typically Bloomfieldian quiet wit and with highly imaginative drawings done by Leonard himself. Unfortunately, Bloomfield was not able to make any headway in persuading any school authorities or educationists to take an interest in his reading materials. The story of these difficulties belongs, however, in the years he spent at the University of Chicago, where he went from Ohio State in 1927 and was to remain until 1940.

CHAPTER 4
CHICAGO
(1927-1940)

LANGUAGE

BY

LEONARD BLOOMFIELD

PROFESSOR OF GERMANIC PHILOLOGY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



NEW YORK
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

CHAPTER 4

CHICAGO (1927–1940)

The occasion for Bloomfield's going to Chicago was his being called to the chair of Germanic Philology, left vacant by the retirement of his former mentor Francis A. Wood. (Hans Kurath then took Bloomfield's place at Ohio State.) When the Bloomfields moved to Chicago, their first address was 5464 Everett Avenue, in an area east of the Illinois Central Railroad's embankment. Later, they moved to the area north of the University, at 1030 East 49th Street, in what had formerly been the coach-house of a mansion there. Both places were within walking-distance of the University. Those were the days of Al Capone and other gangsters, and Chicago was a notoriously unsafe city, even in the neighborhood of the University. Bloomfield was held up at least once.

At the University, Martin Schütze and Carl Darling Buck were still on the faculty, as well as Philip Schuyler Allen (1872-1937) in German literature. Edward Sapir's long stay in Ottawa (which had begun in 1910), for which Bloomfield envied him, but which he regarded as an exile, had ended in 1925 with a call to Chicago. He and Bloomfield were, therefore, colleagues there for four years, until Sapir's departure for Yale in 1931. Despite their mutual interest in American Indian languages, Bloomfield and Sapir do not seem to have been very congenial colleagues. In their outlook on scholarly matters, their student Charles Frederick ("Carl") Voegelin (1906-1986) reported that each admired certain of the other's characteristics, while disliking others:

Sapir admired Bloomfield's ability patiently to excerpt data and collate slips until the patterns of the language emerged, but spoke deprecatingly of Bloomfield's sophomoric psychology. Bloomfield was dazzled by Sapir's virtuosity and perhaps a bit jealous of it, but in matters outside linguistics referred to Sapir as a "medicine man".

Basically, their personalities were too different for them to have "clicked" together. Sapir, according to all reports, was very ebullient, sociable, a brilliant

conversationalist with an eloquent and highly developed extempore style, and an ability to equal (and, in many instances, outshine) his interlocutors on almost any topic. Bloomfield, on the other hand, was shy, retiring, almost self-effacing, and a man of few words. They were both Jews, but from widely different traditions within Judaism: Bloomfield from the free-thinking side of the Austrian Jewish enlightenment, and Sapir from a very orthodox approach, which he rejected for a time, but towards which he later returned. Léon Després reports that Sapir was very helpful in the establishment of a society for Jewish students at the University of Chicago, and opines that Bloomfield would never have been interested in any such activity. Després also tells of a joking explanation which Bloomfield once gave of the origin of the Hebrew phrase *Yom Kippur* 'Day of Atonement': two Jews were walking along the sea-shore, saw some kippered herring, and exclaimed "Yum, yum, kipper!". One wonders what Sapir's reaction to this story might have been: would he perhaps have thought it blasphemous?

Both Bloomfield and Sapir had a thorough command of the grammatical and stylistic resources of English, but each used them in a different way from the other. Sapir's style was much more colorful than Bloomfield's, and he was much more given to inserting "purple patches" containing highly imaginative similes or metaphors. Thus, for instance, speaking of obligatory form-categories in language, he says:

It is almost as though at some period in the past the unconscious mind of the race had made a hasty inventory of experience, committed itself to a premature classification that allowed of no revision, and saddled the inheritors of its language with a science that they no longer quite believed in nor had the strength to overthrow.

(Note, by the way, that the scientific character of this observation is preserved by Sapir's use of the expression "as though".) Perhaps the best known of Sapir's "lapidary" formulations is his observation, à propos of the absence of correlation between types of linguistic structure and levels of culture, that "When it comes to linguistic form, Plato walks with the Macedonian swineherd, Confucius with the head-hunting savage of Assam". In discussing the dependence of literary expression on the resources of the language in which it is created, Sapir did not shun such assertions as that "Single Algonkin words are like tiny imagist poems" and that "With Heine [...] one is under the illusion that the universe speaks German".

Bloomfield, on the other hand, was stylistically much more concise and much less given to flights of fancy, no matter how imaginative or stimulating they might seem to the relatively casual reader. (But, then, Bloomfield was not writing for any-one except the most careful reader.) Nevertheless, Bloomfield could turn an apt phrase, on occasion, just as well as Sapir. One such instance is found in his discussion of metaphor:

Poetic metaphor is largely an outgrowth of the transferred use of ordinary speech. To quote a very well chosen example, when Wordsworth wrote

*The gods approve
The depth and not the tumult of the soul,*

he was only continuing the metaphoric use current in such expressions as *deep*, *ruffled*, or *stormy* feelings. By making a new transference on the model of these old ones, he revived the "picture". The picturesque saying that "language is a book of faded metaphors" is the reverse of the truth, for poetry is rather a blazoned book of language.

Bloomfield was just as sensitive to literary values as was Sapir, but he was much more chary of expressing his judgments in such matters. It is significant that, of the many treatments of general linguistics that have appeared in this century, Bloomfield's *Language* is one of the few that contain no chapter on the relation between language and literature.

At Chicago, Bloomfield was at last free of what he regarded as a chore, the burden of teaching elementary German. (Many of us would have regarded being relieved of such work at such an early age as hardly to be expected in normal American university conditions.) He gave only advanced courses, mainly in Germanic philology — primarily German, Gothic, and Old Norse. Nevertheless, he was connected with and concerned with the teaching of elementary German there, at least to a certain extent, as is evident from a letter of his to Dean Brumbaugh of the University's College dated October 25, 1939:

The administrative treatment of German has always seemed inexplicable to me. Way back in 1917 when I was temporarily for the first time in charge of the Department, our sections were closed early in the Autumn registration, and we estimated that we had turned away as many students as we had admitted. When I made a protest, I got the obviously incorrect answer that budgetary considerations forbade our giving more sections — this of the one phase of our work that earns money for the University! During the years that followed, I was not officially concerned with elementary instruction, but I heard many complaints. It was a standing joke with our staff that whenever the registration in elementary German

went up, the Junior College Department of Modern Languages added an instructor in French or Spanish; they claimed to have statistical proof of this. Whether the facts are correct, I do not know, but the statements show the feeling at that time of the staff. Now, upon again assuming responsibility for this work, I find a fluctuation or compromise between turning students away and overcrowding the sections.

The only course I had with Bloomfield was in Gothic, in 1935. He was a quiet but very firm and demanding teacher, insisting on exactitude in both translation and linguistic analysis. Many of his students, perhaps the majority, were specialists in literature, taking courses in philology only to meet a requirement. They often resented Bloomfield's unwillingness to accept approximations in lieu of accurate statements and formulations, for instance when they were called upon to trace the etymology of a word or the development of a sound-change. For example, he refused to accept any discussion of a phonological development as a "tendency", insisting that such terminology obscured the essential nature of sound-change, which he viewed as uncompromisingly regular. Some *littérateurs* were repelled by Bloomfield's unwillingness to admit the influence of unpredictable "spiritual" factors in language. In the course in Gothic which I took with him, he was unfailingly courteous, but others have reported that on occasion, when confronted with excessive stupidity, he could make cutting remarks.

After leaving Ohio State, Bloomfield inevitably took a less active part in helping with the preparation of the volumes of *Language* than he had done when in close daily contact with Bolling. He attended meetings of the Linguistic Society regularly and read papers. The Linguistic Institute, which was held every summer under the auspices of the Society from 1928 onward (with the exception of the Depression years of 1932-1935), did not have Bloomfield as a member of its teaching staff until 1935, although he attended its summer meetings of the Society that were held in connection with the Institute beginning in 1932. Another major undertaking sponsored by the Linguistic Society was the great *Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada*, for which plans were laid in the late 1920's and on which actual field work was begun in 1931 for the first subsection, the *Linguistic Atlas of New England*, Bloomfield was on the original committee of the Society concerned with initiating the Atlas, but took no part in the development, field work or publication. In accordance with the plan laid out at the beginning of the Society's existence for the Signers of the Call to be its first presidents, Leonard Bloomfield's turn came in 1936. His Presidential address was "Language or Ideas?".

In this paper he argued that what we usually term “ideas” are simply linguistic phenomena in the brains of speakers, rather than metaphysical entities. J Milton Cowan (b.1907) reports that both Sapir and Bloomfield attended the summer meeting of the Linguistic Society at Ann Arbor in 1937, at which Sapir definitely outshone Bloomfield.

Scholarly works from Bloomfield’s pen continued to appear in the late 1920’s and early 1930’s in an uninterrupted flow, with his books *Menomini Texts* in 1928 and *Sacred Stories of the Sweet Grass Cree* in 1930. (The latter was published in a series put out by the Canadian Museum in Ottawa.) He also wrote a number of articles and book-reviews on general linguistics and Germanic. Bloomfield also kept up his interest in Panini, as shown in an article on that Indic grammarian published just before he left Ohio State and in a review of a book by Bruno Liebich soon after the move to Chicago.

Two particularly important reviews came from Bloomfield’s pen in the early Chicago period. One, which appeared in 1928, was of a work on Dutch-Flemish dialectology by Gerardus Gesinus Kloeke (1887-1963), on the expansion of the Dutch language in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as reflected in the modern dialects (*De Hollandsche expansie in de zestiende en zeventiende eeuw en haar weerspiegeling in de hedendaagsche Nederlandsche dialecten*). Kloeke based his discussion on the different treatment of the forms corresponding to standard Dutch *hus* ‘house’ and *mus* ‘mouse’, with the dialectal reflexes of the two undergoing different adaptations to the current pronunciation of the vowel sound represented by *u* in the standard language. Bloomfield found Kloeke’s analysis and discussion of the linguistic facts excellent, so much so that in his 1933 *Language* he used Kloeke’s material to exemplify the phenomena of phonemic shift under the influence of a standard language. Bloomfield also saw in Kloeke’s material the basis for a new type of dialectology based on phonemic contrasts, rather than on differences in raw phonetic differences. But Kloeke, although his procedure and analysis was based squarely on the “Neogrammarian” assumption of regular sound change, nevertheless denied it in his theoretical *obiter dicta* on the matter. In this matter, Bloomfield pointed out Kloeke’s inconsistency and criticized him severely for it.

Another important review was that of *Lautgesetz und Analogie* by Eduard Hermann (1869-1950) in volume 8 of *Language* (1933). In this review he

criticizes, mercilessly but justifiably, Hermann's pandering to popular misconceptions of the nature of language and of language change, especially in denying the underlying postulate of the regularity of sound change when it is not interfered with by other factors. Bloomfield had already given what he and many others since his time have regarded as definitive proof of the validity of the "Neogrammarian hypothesis" in a two-page article "A note on sound-change", in volume 4 of *Language* (1928). In this short but highly important discussion he cites a form from a little-known Algonquian dialect, Swampy Cree, /mihtkw-/ 'red', as confirming a consonant cluster /çk/ [ɣk] which he had set up for his reconstructed Proto-Central Algonquian on the basis of an aberrant sound correspondence in related words in Fox, Ojibwa, Plains Cree, and Menominee. Later, Father James A. Geary (1882-1960), of the Catholic University of America, discovered attestations of further instances of this same correspondence in other morphemes, by applying the principles of philological text analysis to early missionary records of Algonquian languages. But, as Bolling pointed out in a short paragraph added to Bloomfield's note, the validity of a phonetic "law" depends, not on the number of sound correspondences involved, but on the presence of even a single set of relationships which cannot be explained by any other hypothesis than that of regular sound-change.

These numerous contributions pale into relative insignificance, however, in comparison with the book that virtually all commentators consider Bloomfield's supreme masterpiece, his *Language* of 1933, published, like his 1914 book, by Henry Holt of New York. It purports (according to Bloomfield's statement in the Introduction) to be simply a revision of the 1914 work. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In reality, the 1933 book is an entirely new work, differing in context, in approach, and to a certain extent even in style, from the earlier one. It had a basically favorable reception from reviewers and became widely used as a text in beginning linguistics courses during the next twenty-five and more years. Bloomfield used to refer to it as "my high school text", since he thought he had made it simple enough to be understood by the ordinary high school student. In fact, however, the general public found it difficult to understand, because of Bloomfield's overly straightforward and extremely concise presentation and also his detached, uncompromisingly scientific approach. He is said to have told the Anglicist Charles Carpenter Fries (1887-1967) that he (Bloomfield) had tried to write a book that

book that would explain linguistics to the general public, but had not succeeded, and that Fries should undertake the task.

The organization of Bloomfield's *Language* was by no means novel, since his 1914 *Introduction* had been constructed along much the same lines. In their discussion of abstract theory, both Saussure and Sapir had emphasized the separation of the synchronic and the diachronic aspects of language, and the primacy of the former in analysing and discussing linguistic phenomena. Bloomfield keeps these two aspects rigorously apart, with the first part of the book devoted to the observation and description of language; a transitional chapter on writing and its rôle in enabling us to study the linguistic usage of the past; and a second part summarizing the methods and findings of philologists and historians of language. These two main sections are framed by an initial chapter on "The Study of Language", devoted to the development of a scientific approach to the subject, and a final chapter on "Applications and Outlook".

The merits of Bloomfield's treatise are very great, and should be obvious to the unprejudiced reader. Bloomfield uses the techniques of analysis and presentation that he had worked out in his *Tagalog Texts*, his discussions of Algonquian languages, and his *First German Book*, proceeding from one step to the next with quasi-mathematical rigor, but always with complete clarity. His study of Panini is reflected in the concision of his formulations, for instance with regard to word formation in English. In both main sections, the descriptive and the historical, Bloomfield takes local variation in speech into account, and his chapter on dialectology is a masterly summary of earlier scholars' findings and an integration of them into general linguistic theory. The examples he cites in his 1933 *Language* (in contrast to those used in the 1914 book) are drawn largely from his own research, with copious quotations from Tagalog and Menominee, as well as from American English.

Later historians of linguistics, concentrating their attention on mere theory (as opposed to full treatment of the subject with exemplifications and applications) have tended to view Bloomfield's 1933 *Language* as consisting simply of rehashed Saussure diluted with "Watsonian" behaviorism. Such an interpretation neglects the many positive additions and improvements which Bloomfield brought to the influence which Saussure's *Cours* undoubtedly did exert on him at a stage when his development was threatening to stagnate. Those of us who, in connection with the war effort in the early 1940's (see our

Chapter 5), needed guidance for our work with regard to both theory and method, searched for it in such manuals as those of Sapir, Saussure, and Vendryès, but found it nowhere but in Bloomfield.

The crowning merits of Bloomfield's 1933 *Language* were, as Charles Hockett has suggested, two: first of all his equation of the phonemic principle, on the synchronic plane, with that of regularity in sound change in that of diachronic development; and, secondly, his integration of material gathered at first hand from work on the field with information derived from secondary sources. In the category of "field work material" we must include, not only that obtained from speakers of previously unwritten (e.g., Amerindian) tongues, but also the findings of dialectologists, especially in linguistic geography. William G. Moulton (b.1914) has rightly emphasized the great and hitherto neglected merits of Bloomfield's work in dialectology, in both his book *Language* and his little-known article on the development of /k/ in German. In the last-mentioned paper, Bloomfield introduced into actual dialectological analysis, for the first time and long before any-one else, the principle of phonemic, rather than simply phonetic, contrast as a major factor in determining dialect areas. (He had discussed this principle in his 1928 review of Kloeke, as we have already seen, in theory, but his article on German /k/ represented its first application in practice.) In all of these respects, Bloomfield's work marked a major advance over all his predecessors, including the 1916 *Cours* of the quasi-Saussure.

Yet, despite its immense merits, Bloomfield's *Language* met with considerable resistance, some from professional linguists and philologists, and some from non-linguists. The specialists in language matters tended to be "put off" by some of Bloomfield's flouting of convention in such respects as his rather idiosyncratic use of some symbols of the International Phonetic Alphabet, e.g., the character [ɛ] for the vowel-sound [æ] (as in *hat*) and [o] for that of *son*, and his formulation of the vowels of *hate* and *bone* as [ej] and [ow], respectively. More serious was the objection, raised primarily by European scholars, that the "Neogrammarians" of the 1870's had been shown, especially by such linguistic geographers as Jules Gilliéron, to be in the wrong with their (admittedly overly dogmatic and oversimplified assertion that "phonetic laws admit of no exceptions" (*Die Lautgesetze kennen keine Ausnahmen*)). A propos of the expression "phonetic law", Bloomfield often

remarked that it was a bad misnomer, since the term *law* was not applicable to a single historical event such as a sound change. He used to say that it made no more sense to talk about “Grimm’s Law” than it did to speak of “the law of Gettysburg”. He was too well acquainted with the work of the Neogrammarians, especially as summarized in the *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (1880) of Hermann Paul (1846-1921), to be unaware of the dangers inherent in the metaphorical use of that term.

Bloomfield’s European critics dismissed him, therefore, as a belated follower of an outworn and discredited doctrine, operating in a culturally marginal region and without knowledge or understanding of modern developments. It was useless to reply to such carpers that Bloomfield had proved the validity of the postulate of regularity in sound change by demonstrating its universal applicability with examples drawn from language families such as Algonquian and (as shown by Sapir) Athabaskan. Their answer was that these were unwritten tongues of savage tribes and unfit to be compared with “languages of civilization” such as Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, or the modern literary standards.

The non-specialist reader, on the other hand, tended to react negatively to Bloomfield’s uncompromising objectivity and rejection of all mentalistic explanations, above all with regard to meaning. Some critics, particularly specialists in literature, interpreted his avoidance of mentalism as a denial that the phenomena which they regarded as “mental” have any existence at all. It was unavailing for him or others to point out that he was in no wise denying the existence of such phenomena. He was simply seeking a different explanation from those customarily given, and was maintaining that it was unnecessary to set up undemonstrable entities such as a non-physical “mind” or “spirit” to explain the nature and use of language. In this respect, he was simply applying “Occam’s razor”, *Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*, which in this context might be paraphrased “Don’t set up more factors in your analysis than are strictly necessary”.

Similarly, his emphasis on the difficulty of obtaining a complete scientific analysis of the meaning of a linguistic form, and his emphasis on the necessity of beginning one’s analysis starting from form rather than from meaning, was interpreted as a denial that meaning existed or was relevant to linguistics at all. The same misinterpretation was placed on his insistence that the meaning of a

form had no influence on its phonological development. Again, it was futile to point out that, throughout his work, Bloomfield regarded meaning as an essential part of human behavior, and that he devoted a whole chapter to it in his 1933 *Language*.

Bloomfield was quite aware of these misrepresentations, and did his best to dispel the misunderstandings involved. As late as 1945, he was still having to make disclaimers such as the following (contained in a letter to Kenneth L. Pike [b.1912]):

It has become painfully common to say that I, or rather a whole group of language students of whom I am one, pay no attention to meaning or neglect it, or even that we undertake to study language without meaning, simply as meaningless sounds. [...] It is not just a personal affair in the statements to which I have referred, but something which, if allowed to develop, will injure the progress of our science by setting up a fictitious contrast between students who consider meaning and students who neglect it. The latter class, so far as I know, does not exist.

Unfortunately, there did indeed exist such a class of scholars, of the following generation, including Zellig S. Harris (b.1909), George L. Trager (b.1906), and Bernard Bloch (1907-1965). For these and their disciples, descriptive linguistics was in theory (but only in theory) limited to the enumeration of patterns of distribution of phonemes and sequences of phonemes, with meaning taken into consideration only as a factor serving to differentiate between sequences. From this thoroughly mistaken notion arose, especially in Europe, the further misconception that all American linguists viewed meaning in this light, and that we had derived the notion from Bloomfield. (I once published an article on "The semantics of the Roumanian neuter", and was told that, as a pupil of Bloomfield's, I had no business discussing meaning!)

My own reservations concerning Bloomfield's *Language* and his over-all approach to linguistics are related, rather, to his view of the individual's speech and usage in relation to the community; of the relation of phonetics to linguistic structure; and of the nature of meaning, rather than of its importance in linguistics. In his later years, Bloomfield tended to regard the individual's experience and usage as subordinate to the life of the group, and went so far as to treat society as an organism in its own right. This seems to me an untenable position, since social groups do not have genetically conditioned life cycles, do

not reproduce themselves by genetic transmission, and do not consist of parts which cannot exist apart from other parts of the group. Each individual's speech habits (his or her IDIOLECT), which is almost but never wholly identical to the idiolects of his or her fellow speakers, is the fundamental entity, by analysis of which we arrive at the structure of the "language"; but Bloomfield would probably not have accepted this essentially Jespersenian view.

It seems to me, furthermore, that Bloomfield was quite wrong in considering phonetics as irrelevant to phonemic structure or to the structure of a language as a whole. French would not be French, say, without its front-rounded and nasalized vowels. These are among the features that signal to us that we are hearing French, not Italian or Spanish or some other language. He was also mistaken in objecting to Ogden and Richards' three-way distinction between LINGUISTIC FORM – SENSE – REFERENT because it seemed to him "mentalistic". Even if the "sense" of a form exists in each speaker's head, and therefore cannot be gotten at directly by present-day methods of investigation, it does not follow that we have to ascribe it to a non-physical *locus existendi*. For that matter, "mind" itself does not have to be defined as non-physical, as Bloomfield thought in his later years that it did. As I observed repeatedly in conversation, he eventually developed a psychological block against the very words *mind* and *mental*.

For the remainder of the decade of the 1930's, Bloomfield continued his publications in general linguistics and in Germanic, with fewer items but wider-reaching implications, particularly for the relation of linguistics to such neighboring disciplines as psychology and the general theory of science. In 1939 he brought out a short but important monograph, *Linguistic Aspects of Science*, setting forth his views on the nature of scientific method and its relevance to the structure of language, particularly from an objectivist point of view. In this respect, Bloomfield's approach was in some ways parallel to that of the "Viennese school" and other positivist philosophers. Certainly he had no prejudice against philosophers as such; I remember walking along the street once in the 1940's in front of the Yale Faculty-Club and coming across Bloomfield and Ernst Cassirer (1874-1945) seated on the front porch in amicable converse, presumably about their mutual interests in these matters.

Bloomfield continued to review works in Germanic philology, and published the already mentioned short but important article on "Initial [k] in

German" (1938), combining the study of phonetic and phonemic change with dialect geography. Although his work on Tagalog was, by now, in the past, he still took an interest in comparative Malayo-Polynesian, enough so to defend the work of the leader in that field, Otto Dempwolff (1871–1938) against the unjustified animadversions of one Gerhard Laves. Bloomfield also found time to prepare a structural sketch of his reconstruction of Proto-Central-Algonquian. The publication of this sketch was delayed until 1946, when it appeared in the volume *Linguistic Structures of Native America* edited by Harry Hoijer (1904–1976). In the 1930's, however, he published only small sections of this work, as in his "Menomini morphophonemics", in the 1939 homage volume in memory of Nikolaj Sergeevich Trubetzkoy (1890–1938).

At some time after his arrival in Chicago, Bloomfield got in touch with the "reading specialists" in the University's School of Education with regard to the materials which he had developed for teaching reading on the elementary level. He met with a very cool reception. The educationists had no knowledge of the nature of language, nor of the relation between sounds and letters in an alphabetical writing-system. They were, therefore, unable to understand even the most basic of the principles on which Bloomfield's materials were based. Those were the times when the "see-and-say" method was being developed, whereby children were taught to associate written words with their pronunciation as global wholes, with no analysis of the single graphemes, and spellings were taught as if each written word were a single, unanalysable unit like a Chinese "ideograph". This approach was embodied in the notorious "Dick, Jane, and Spot" series of readers developed under the aegis of William S. Gray (1885–1960) of the University of Chicago's School of Education. Needless to say, the "see-and-say" method of teaching reading delayed millions of children in their learning to read. Those who did master that art did so in spite of, not because of the way they were taught.

Bloomfield's materials, therefore, never received any consideration from educationists or publishers. They were never given any trial in public schools, though they were used with great success in a Chicago parochial school and by individual parents. They were not published in Bloomfield's lifetime. As a result, he developed a strong emotional block against any and all educationists — an attitude reflected in the last chapter of his 1933 *Language*, where he says "in view of our schools' concentration on linguistic discipline, it is surprising

to see that they are utterly benighted in linguistic matters" (499) and "Nothing could be more discouraging than to read our 'educationists'" treatises on teaching children to read". On a later occasion, he was even more condemnatory, saying in his article "Twenty-one years of the Linguistic Society":

The basic teaching of our schools, in reading and writing, in standard language and composition [...], is still dominated by educationists who, knowing nothing about language, waste years of every child's life, and leave our community semi-literate.

Even allowing for Bloomfield's unacknowledged emotional involvement and resultant overstatements, there was and still is a great deal of justification for his criticisms.

Part of the strong condemnation expressed in the last sentence quoted above was an outgrowth of Bloomfield's disgust with the inexactitude and inaccuracy of the folklore taught in our schools as "grammar" (e.g., "a noun is the name of a person, place, or thing"). He used to say that it would be better for school children to remain totally ignorant of grammar than to be taught such traditional but false doctrines. On more than one occasion, I argued with him about this opinion of his, and tried to point out that, if a child is to recognize the desirability of analysing language at all, this must be demonstrated to him at an age when he is interested in such matters. Even if what the child learns is wrong, he can unlearn it later. But, once he has passed beyond the stage of acquiring his native language (normally wholly outside of awareness), he no longer sees any need for discussing or analysing it. I wish I had known the mediaeval Latin aphorism *Melius invenitur veritas ex errore quam ex ignorantia* 'it is easier to get at the truth starting from a wrong notion than from no notion at all', so as to quote it to Bloomfield.

It is doubtful whether Bloomfield would have accepted this argument, however, because he was not willing to recognize that there is such a thing as an optimum stage in a person's development for having a particular interest or acquiring a certain type of knowledge. This attitude stemmed from his rejection of genetic factors in human development. The historian wonders: was it perhaps his (and, presumably, Goodie's) failure to recognize the importance of age levels in an individual's life that led them to adopt their elder son, Roger, at a stage when he was clearly too old for his already acquired behavior patterns and attitudes to be modified in a new environment?

Bloomfield had not been on the staff of any Linguistic Institute before 1938. During the summers of 1938 and 1940, he taught at the Linguistic Institute at Ann Arbor, giving in each a course on general linguistics and a seminar on a special topic. The 1938 general linguistics course was particularly successful, being attended by virtually all the faculty and students, and arousing great interest and enthusiasm. In 1938 he gave a seminar on the Central Algonquian languages (Fox, Ojibwa, Cree, Menominee); in 1940, this was replaced by one, given jointly with Edgar H. Sturtevant, on "Special Problems in Linguistics". The Linguistic Society began holding summer-meetings, in conjunction with the Linguistic Institute, from 1938 onward. Bloomfield attended those held at Ann Arbor from 1938 to 1940, as well as the North Carolina meeting in 1941. At these meetings he regularly gave papers, as well as special talks for the related Linguistic Institutes.

During these years in Chicago, Bloomfield had a certain amount of social life, though not (according to reports) very willingly, being more or less compelled to by his wife. She had, Léon Després reports, "a very good artistic appreciation, and a specially good eye for decorative art. She constantly bought things from second-hand dealers, with great perception and taste". The Bloomfields' house therefore contained a great many *objets d'art* of high quality. Certain graduate students used to criticize Bloomfield behind his back, with envy for what they thought to be a wealthy man's collection, and condemned his supposed avoidance of Chicago's personal property tax. These animadversions were, at least in part, expressions of anti-Jewish sentiments. In fact, it would seem that the cash-value of these objects was not very high. Bloomfield also attended at least some of the meetings of the University's German club, at the International House or Ida Noyes Hall. On occasion, I saw him at these meetings, conversed with him in German about linguistics and more general matters, and we joined the group in singing such traditional songs as "Die Lorelei" or "Ännchen von Tharau". If I remember aright, he had quite a good singing voice.

Bloomfield's work habits were very intensive and firmly set. He thought highly of people who worked hard, and held in proportionate disesteem those who did not. John Kunstmann (1895–1989), a student of Bloomfield's at Chicago, reported to George Metcalf (b.1908) that Bloomfield would normally be brought to the University in the family's automobile by his wife at around 8.00 or 8.30 a.m., and would remain there until around 6 p.m., when she

would come and fetch him. Some reports have it that he would normally do no further work during the rest of the day, and some persons opined that this had been written into Leonard and Alice's marriage contract. (But, according to Léon Després, neither of them came from a family which observed the traditional Jewish custom of establishing a marriage contract.) Després also reports that every evening, after they had been to some gathering or other type of entertainment, Bloomfield would put in another hour of work before going to bed. He was very devoted to his wife, and would suffer through what must have seemed to him many extremely boring and unprofitable hours as long as she was happy. Kunstmann told Metcalf of one occasion when he (Kunstmann) met the Bloomfields as they were coming out of one of the garish moving picture palaces on Chicago's South Side, and Bloomfield said that the picture was wretched but that Goodie had enjoyed it, so it was all right.

There are various anecdotes of Bloomfield's unusual behavior at social gatherings. On one occasion, Léon Després tells us, some-one had given him a new necktie, which he had with him in a box at the party. At eleven p.m., he took the tie out of the box, announced solemnly "It is time to change neckties", and proceeded to take off the one he had on and replace it with the other, *coram populo*. On another occasion, whether at Chicago or Yale I do not know, he is said to have been at a large function of some university administrator. He was always uncomfortable in the company of academic "big shots" and "stuffed shirts", and at one point some one noticed that he had disappeared. After much searching, they found him in the basement, where he had taken refuge, and was sitting at a table in quiet and friendly conversation with the janitor.

The only occasion on which I met Bloomfield's wife was in the summer of 1937. At the end of 1936, I was preparing to leave Chicago for my first job, at the University of Puerto Rico. When I told Bloomfield of my plans, he asked me to look up his Harvard classmate Bill O'Reilly (cf. Chapter 1). On my first day at the U.P.R., I met O'Reilly, who by that time had become a professor of English there. I told him immediately that Bloomfield was my mentor at Chicago, and had asked me to look him, O'Reilly, up. He was highly pleased to learn how far in the world Bloomfield had come, and the two corresponded, at least briefly, in the spring of 1937. When my wife Frances and I visited Chicago that summer, I told Bloomfield that I had news of O'Reilly, whereupon he invited us to have dinner with him and his wife at their home.

When we arrived at their house, Bloomfield introduced us to Goodie and their two pets, a pair of dachshunds. There was no sign of their adopted sons, so presumably both Roger and James had left home by then. Their dachshunds were very frisky, jumping around all the time from one of the four of us to another. They seemed, for some reason, to have taken an especial liking to me, so that both before and after dinner they kept jumping up on my lap. I did my best to conceal my discomfort, much to Frances' amusement. As for the dinner itself, it was very well prepared, as Goodie was an excellent cook. She was short, plump, and kindly, extremely attentive to her husband's and her guests' well-being. Since harmony reigned, she evinced none of the aggressive protectiveness which others report they observed when Leonard's status or views were at all called into question.

In the short interval before dinner, Bloomfield engaged Frances and me in conversation about Puerto Rico and our experiences there. By that time we had become well acquainted with Bill O'Reilly, his wife Georgia, and their two children Pat and Mike (Patricia and Michael). We were able to give Bloomfield a reasonably detailed account of the O'Reillys and their situation. When Bill was sober and teaching his classes at the University, he was excellent, especially in Shakespeare. Unfortunately, on occasion, he would drink too heavily and make a sad spectacle of himself. (We were lucky in that we never saw him in that condition, but we heard about it from Georgia and others.) We did not conceal this from Bloomfield, who reacted in what we came to know was a typical way — restrained and apparently unemotional, but underneath the surface deeply concerned and saddened.

After dinner, Goodie engaged Frances in talk about feminine matters — rather to Frances' disappointment, since she was always being placed in a position where she could not listen to or take part in the men's discussion. Bloomfield asked me about my plans for scholarly work and about my techniques in classroom teaching. He was sorry, but not surprised, to hear that I had had no opportunity to develop any techniques of my own, based on linguistics, for teaching elementary German. As so often happens, I had been obliged to use whatever texts were on hand at the campus book store, a situation aggravated by the isolation of Puerto Rico, especially in those days before extensive connections with the mainland by air.

I also told Bloomfield of my choice of literary texts to use in the elementary and intermediate German-classes. I had given the students Theodor Storm's *Immensee* in the first semester of the course (which I had had to begin "out of phase" in the spring-term of 1937), and was planning to have them read some lyric poetry in the third semester and Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* in the fourth. One of my reasons for choosing the last-mentioned was that it contains considerable highly intelligent discussion of the intellectual and emotional prerequisites for national independence, a problem which was extensively agitated in Puerto Rico, in those times as well as later. I mentioned the contempt in which my fellow graduate students held *Immensee*, an attitude which Bloomfield decried. He said that he had taught *Immensee* eighteen times, and thought highly of it, just as much so the last time as the first.

Bloomfield was quite interested in my experience in learning and using foreign languages. I had to reply that there was very little I could say on the basis of introspection. All that I could observe was that, as my acquaintance with what we would now call the target language developed, my use of it became much more automatic. Thus, for example, in response to a situation in which someone had arrived the previous day, it came completely naturally and without any reflection or analysis to pop out with *er ist gestern angekommen* (literally 'he is yesterday arrived'), or, in a subordinate clause (which I would recognize automatically as such from the preceding context), *daß er gestern angekommen ist* (literally, 'that he yesterday arrived is'). In more modern terms, one might say that one forms "chunks" of behavior patterns which, with repetition, come out automatically in fixed sequences whenever they are called into play. Bloomfield said that my experience agreed with his, and that the psychology of the time was unable to explain the phenomenon except by ascribing it to some unobservable non-physical "mental" faculty. I said nothing in reply to this, since I was still to a considerable extent under the spell of the traditional "mentalistic" approach.

During the evening, Bloomfield manifested none of the boredom or eccentricities which we are told characterized his attitude at some social gatherings. On this occasion, at least, he was attentive and interested in all that we had to tell him and his wife. This was presumably because we had news of his old friend Bill O'Reilly and the situation in Puerto Rico, and because I had observations concerning my experiences in German language teaching and linguistics to pass on to him.

Neither on this nor on later occasions did we ever discuss political matters with Bloomfield. His opinions were, so far as one could gather from scattered remarks which I heard or which others reported as coming from him, those of the typical "liberal" of the time. It is said that he greatly admired the cogency of Karl Marx's reasoning in the latter's writings. (How much this attitude may possibly have represented a community of views with his sister Marie, there is no way of knowing.) Bloomfield was very equalitarian. Léon Després reports that he said (referring to Negroes) that in Chicago "When children are born, each seventh child has a mark placed on his forehead", and that the United States could not be called a democracy until a Negro was elected President. Sometimes Bloomfield let his personal feelings show in his writings, for instance when speaking of the "snobberies and imbecilities which make a by-word of the American college" (1933:504), or saying "Linguistics cannot tell us whether it is helpful to subject one tenth of the population to desperate handicaps because their parents failed to go through a ceremony of marriage. The linguist can merely note that the matter is hardly ever discussed and that until recently the matter was under a tabu" (1933:507).

After the political upheaval in Germany in 1933, when the National Socialist party came to power, Bloomfield reacted with restrained but obviously strong hostility, as did a great number of people in the United States. He observed that if Hitler were to come to power here, he would write to the University of Mexico asking for a position, and that if he did not receive a positive answer in two weeks, he would commit suicide. This was in the context of the debates in the middle 1930's, with some persons saying "It couldn't happen here", and others replying "Yes, it could happen here". Bloomfield had been to Europe at least twice in the 1920's, but it is not known whether he went to Germany or Austria on these occasions, nor to what extent he had kept abreast of the rapidly worsening economic and social situation in Germany in the early 1930's, which rendered conditions there far more desperate than those prevailing in any other industrial nation of that period.

By this time, Bloomfield's extreme modesty and shyness had become known to all who came in contact with him at the Linguistic Institutes or the meetings of the Linguistic Society. As Bernard Bloch observed in his obituary, "His personality was not strongly magnetic. He was too unassuming to impose it on others, too withdrawn to enjoy the immediate satisfaction of dominating

an audience". It was undoubtedly this attitude that made him, by and large, a rather poor lecturer, except when he was talking to a gathering of specialists in linguistics. He decried polemics and "getting back at" persons who had given offence. Hockett reports, à propos of retaliation, that Bloomfield told him "Oh, no, you mustn't do that sort of thing. It just makes everybody unhappy". On one occasion, at the Linguistic Society's meeting at Providence in December of 1940, at a session at which Bloomfield was not present, the dialectologist Miles Hanley (1893-1954) prefaced an expression of disagreement with one of Bloomfield's theories by saying "I know that Leonard Bloomfield is a saint, but nevertheless I think he is wrong" (on whatever it was).

When Bloomfield came to the University of Chicago in 1927, its president was a mathematical physicist, Max Mason (1877-1967). It was not dominated by any group representing one specific intellectual bias or ideology. The situation changed drastically in 1928 when a young professor of law, Robert Maynard Hutchins (1899-1977) was called from his deanship at Yale to be Mason's successor as president at Chicago. His arrival was heralded by a great deal of fanfare in connection with a drastically revised organization of undergraduate and graduate studies. The new dispensation was widely referred to as the "Hutchins plan", although it had actually been thought out by Dean Chauncey S. Boucher (1886-1955) before Hutchins' arrival. A new intellectual orthodoxy was set up, based on neo-Aristotelian and neo-Thomistic philosophy. New professorial appointments were made in line with this approach, especially that of an equally young, brash, and conceited professor of philosophy, Mortimer J. Adler (b.1900). I was a beginning graduate student in the fall of 1931, when the "Hutchins plan" was inaugurated. It was distinguished especially by the institution of freshman seminars in the four main Divisions of the University. We heard from freshmen how, in the Humanities seminars, Hutchins and Adler dazzled selected groups by dancing dialectical rings around them in their discussions of abstruse philosophical topics in a neo-Thomistic vein.

In its new appointments, the Hutchins administration was concerned especially with attracting "headliners", men who were already widely known and who would presumably attract attention to the University. One of their worst miscalculations in this respect was the naming of an Italian essayist, Giuseppe Antonio Borgese (1882-1952), to the chair of Italian literature. A

real “physigunkus”, Borgese failed miserably in that position, and in 1939 succeeded in driving away the one young woman who had remained as a graduate student in Italian. (During the early 1940’s, he and Hutchins spent their time planning for a world government to be established after the end of the war.) Such was the intellectual atmosphere at Chicago in the middle and late 1930’s.

In that environment, a scholar of Bloomfield’s type was obviously very much out of place. A man of his modesty and self-effacement would hardly have been recognized immediately as a “headliner”, even though he was enjoying an ever-increasing meed of respect and admiration from his professional colleagues. He would undoubtedly have wished to be at some institution where he could devote his entire time to his scholarship and to teaching on an advanced level, with no administrative responsibilities. The situation was not improved when Archer Taylor left the chairmanship of the Germanics department at Chicago, to go to the University of California at Berkeley, in 1939. Bloomfield was thereupon asked to act as temporary chairman for 1939-1940. His salary, which had been set at \$6000 in 1927 (not a bad sum for that time*), was increased by \$500 as extra compensation for being acting chairman.

In August of 1939, a crisis arose, in that Bloomfield was offered a Sterling Professorship at Yale, on terms embodying just the kind of conditions which he was undoubtedly wishing for: the freedom to devote himself entirely to scholarship and advanced teaching, no administrative work, and secretarial assistance of a kind he did not have at Chicago. There had been a small Department of Linguistics at Chicago since December of 1933, with Bloomfield as its chairman, but it had only a few faculty members and had been so ineffectual as to be the object of a suggestion in early 1939 that it be abolished (a suggestion which was rejected by the University’s administration). There were indeed other linguists at Chicago in the 1930’s, such as the phonetician Clarence Edward Parmenter (1888-1982); the Romance (especially Spanish) philologist Hayward Keniston; the Sanskritist George V. Bobrinskoy (1902-1974); the anthropologists Manuel J. Andrade (1885-1941), and anthropological linguist Harry Hoijer (1904-1976); and also the Indo-Europeanist Carl Darling Buck, who had retired in 1935 but remained in Chicago, still professionally active. But under Bloomfield’s chairmanship, the Department of Lin-

* But William A. Nitze (1876-1957) was receiving \$10,000, and Hayward Keniston (1883-1970) was receiving \$7,000.

guistics seems to have been, in reality, little more than what would nowadays be termed an “interdepartmental program”. There was no Linguistics Club formed at Chicago, as there were at other universities such as Yale.

Bloomfield’s immediate superior in the University administrative hierarchy was the Dean of the Division of the Humanities. This position was filled at the time by Richard P. McKeon (1900–1985), a specialist in mediaeval scholastic philosophy. He had come to Chicago, first as Professor of Classics for two years, and then from 1935 on as Professor of Philosophy. By all accounts, McKeon had a very forceful personality, which many opponents of the Hutchins régime interpreted as authoritarian. In connection with Bloomfield’s departure from Chicago in 1940, the legend arose that McKeon and Hutchins were hostile to linguistics, and especially to Bloomfield’s approach to the subject, because of his uncompromising insistence on a purely scientific analysis — an attitude which they were said to have considered as virtually anathema maranatha because of their prejudice in favor of neo-Thomistic philosophy. A simplified version of this legend runs that Bloomfield “apparently told McKeon that he would be willing to stay at Chicago if McKeon would provide him with secretarial assistance, to which [...] McKeon wished him lots of luck at Yale”.

This picture of McKeon as a cardboard villain, with Hutchins backing him up at a higher level, is shown by newly (1989) available documentation* to be completely out of accord with what actually happened. In August of 1939, McKeon was on vacation in Vermont.

On August 6, he wrote to Emery T. Filbey, Dean of Faculties, saying “Two crises a month is rather too high an August average for a single Division”, and then discussed Bloomfield’s Yale offer in considerable detail, in a single long paragraph — which should, however, be quoted *in toto* in order to give a fair picture of McKeon’s true attitude:

Mr. Bloomfield has had a call to Yale — to a Stirling [*sic*] professorship of Germanic Languages, at a salary of \$10,000, plus secretarial and other assistance, to begin September, 1940. If he accepts we shall be in a hole in two departments in the Division: the German department began to show some promise of getting

* The University’s Archives have a rule that documents in their files on budgets and appointments may be made available to public inspection only fifty years after the date involved, so that the materials from 1939–1940 became open to study only in 1989.

out of the doldrums with Mr. Bloomfield's assistance, and his departure would mean the demise of the Linguistics Department. I realize that we cannot meet Yale's offer, and Bloomfield would have good reason to think that his accomplishments had not been appreciated at Chicago (his salary was \$6,000, from 1927 to 1939, with no raise even when he became Chairman of the Linguistics Department), but I think both linguistics and Bloomfield are of sufficient importance to Chicago to warrant complete review of the questions involved in his decision before a decision is actually reached. I understand he is being urged to send his answer to Yale at once; he has asked whether I have any objection to his interviewing you. I have written to him asking him to put off his decision until October, at which time the President, you and I could go over the question in detail and carefully. I gather that Mr. Bloomfield would be most concerned about the prospects for teaching and research in linguistics at Chicago, and specifically with prospects for himself; I have written him that I should be able to give a complete and honest answer on those questions only after the indicated conversations. Will you see him and urge him to put off his decision until October – I should like to have the opportunity to explain to Mr. Hutchins and to you why I think linguistics and Mr. Bloomfield are very important to the program of research and teaching in the Division. [...]

Yours,

R. P. McKeon.

On August 9, Dean Filbey wrote to President Hutchins, telling him:

McKeon has just written me about the Bloomfield matter. You may be fully advised. Too bad a second-rate institution such as Yale should be given the bargaining power presented by Stirling [*sic*] professorships at \$10,000. What do they do with these men?

Do you have any idea that Bloomfield is as good as McKeon thinks he is? [...] We have just about enough money left to pacify Bloomfield. I will have a good time offering it to him if you would like to have it done.

On August 10, Filbey wrote to McKeon:

I have attempted to arrange for conferences with Bloomfield but find that this cannot be brought about before tomorrow. I shall do my best to hold off his decision and to convince him that we want him to remain at Chicago.

The next relevant item in the University of Chicago's Archives is a memo from McKeon to Bloomfield, dated November 18, 1939:

Dear Mr. Bloomfield:

I noticed in yesterday's paper, and I gather from your note dated November 11, which has just arrived, that you have come to a decision concerning the invitation

which you received from Yale University. I am distressed that my information should come from these sources prior to receiving word from the Board of Trustees. I had assumed that the Board of Trustees would receive and act upon your resignation and your request to be released from your contract with the University before the announcement of your new appointment was made. It occurs to me that you might intend the note which I have just received to be your letter of resignation; please inform me if that is the case, since I shall have to send it to the Board of Trustees for action.

I was extremely distressed, as I told you at our last meeting when you spoke of the possibilities you were considering, by the prospect of losing your services here. Now that you have decided on the step, you have all my best wishes for a happy and productive career in your new post. If there is anything that I can do now or later to facilitate your work there, please let me know. In the meantime I shall be very grateful for any advice or assistance you can give me in continuing the tradition of work which you have set up in the departments of Linguistics and German.

Sincerely yours,

/s/RICHARD P. MCKEON

On November 14, Bloomfield replied to McKeon, saying:

Dear Mr. McKeon:

This is in answer to your note of the 18th, and in confirmation of what I said to you on the 21st of this month.

My letter to you of the 11th was meant as a formal statement of resignation, to take effect October 1st, 1940; it was addressed to you because I viewed myself as having no access to the President or to the Board of Trustees, and as bound to communicate with the Administration only through you — and indeed I see no reason for wishing to do otherwise; my letter was delayed by an unexpected absence of several days. Please therefore transmit my resignation to such administrative quarters as need to be informed.

It is kind of you to express regret at my leaving; I more than share this regret, being attached to the University by lifelong ties and very strong sentiments.

The invitation which I had received offered an unusual opportunity for the work to which I am committed, an opportunity which seemed not likely to be equaled here; nevertheless I tried (and I wish to make this clear beyond any question) to prompt the Administration to state whatever case there might be for my remaining at Chicago. On August 2nd I wrote telling you of the invitation that had come to me, and outlined the factors that would probably lead me to accept it, but asked you to tell me what prospects there might be at Chicago not only for me, but also generally for teaching and research in linguistics. In accordance with the request in

your letter of August 8th, I put off my decision; on August 18th I wrote to you, telling you that I had obtained time for this and asking you to let me have as soon as possible any statements which the Administration might wish me to consider. Only when more than ten weeks had passed without my hearing from the Administration did I conclude that my decision would have to be made upon the basis of actual conditions and trends at the University — and these were by no means encouraging.

Of course my leaving is of minor importance compared to the question arising in connection with it, namely the future of linguistic work at the University. At the risk of being importunate, I feel bound once more to urge upon you the importance of this phase of the University's work.

Sincerely,

Leonard Bloomfield

In an undated memo, McKeon replied (obviously very soon after Bloomfield had written the letter just quoted):

I have received your letter of resignation from the various positions which you hold at the University of Chicago, effective October 1, 1940. I am transmitting this letter to the President with a regretful recommendation that it be accepted.

I am very much puzzled by your statement in the next to the last paragraph of your letter that your decision was made "only when more than ten weeks had passed without my hearing from the Administration". If the ten weeks in question were the first ten weeks of the present quarter, your account makes no mention of the two interviews which I had with you during that period.

For the purpose of the record, permit me to restate the history which you tell in that paragraph. On August 6 I answered your letter of August 2, stating my personal view of the prospect and the future of linguistics at the University of Chicago and urging you to put off your decision until I could speak with the President concerning the rate at which those prospects could be effectuated. During the first week after my return to Chicago, I had a long interview with the President. He expressed himself as being in complete accord with my statement that linguistics and the studies related to linguistics must be fundamental to the graduate work of the Division of the Humanities, and that the organization of studies in the Humanities would be impossible without appropriate basic work in linguistic studies. The prospect for the budget for the coming year, no less than the campaign for funds to solve the financial problem for the next few years, made it impossible at that time to translate these general statements into any concrete terms. You will recall that I interviewed you in my office shortly after this, during the early days of October. It was my intention to convey to you in that interview the favorable attitude of the Administration toward the future development of linguistics and to ask you to be patient concerning the concrete form that it might take. Some weeks later I heard rumors that you had already accepted the invitation which you had been considering. I asked you to come to my office again, and in

that interview I put the question several times in the form, What concretely could I do to persuade you to remain at the University? Your answer, several times repeated, was that there was nothing that I could do. When I offered to relieve you of administrative responsibilities at the end of this year, you pointed out that problems of administration would doubtless continue and that you would doubtless be considered. You said that these worries would interfere with your research and publication, and that you considered the prospect for quiet work better at another institution. Since I thought these were the reasons that were influencing your judgment, and since I think that you are correct in thinking that the problems in Germanics and linguistics will not all be settled within a year, I was compelled to take your answer that there was nothing that I could do to persuade you to remain in Chicago, literally. I am sorry to learn from your letter that I am mistaken in this interpretation, and I should be extremely sorry if your decision has been based even in part on my failure to make myself clear. I don't, in any case, want you to leave the university with the notion that the prospects for linguistics are dark. It is still my intention to do everything I can to make the offering in linguistics at the University of Chicago one of the best in the country.

From this exchange of correspondence, it is evident that, between Bloomfield and McKeon, there was no "meeting of minds". They were not even talking at cross-purposes, they were simply, as the current expression goes, "talking past each other". We have, of course, no way of knowing what the paralinguistic behavior of the two men — in their intonation and other prosodic phenomena, in their voice-qualifiers and bodily posture, and so forth — may have been in the two personal interviews that McKeon refers to. Certainly their styles of negotiation must have been very different. Bloomfield's very great modesty and shyness may have seemed to McKeon simply a mask for stubbornness, and the latter's forcefulness may have struck Bloomfield (as we know it struck many others) as domineering and tyrannical.

Furthermore, the historian wonders, what did the term *linguistics* signify to each of the two men? Bloomfield, as we know, had a very firm conception of linguistics as a strictly scientific discipline. From other firm documents in the University of Chicago's Archives, we know that McKeon expressed to other members of the administration his lack of admiration for what he regarded as concentration on aspects of linguistics involving picayune details, such as the investigations into speech sounds which Parmenter carried on in his phonetics laboratory, or Keniston's concern with statistical analysis of syntax (which McKeon referred to, in a memo to another administrator, as "counting prepositions"). He may well have expressed similar attitudes in open conversation, thereby giving rise to the impression that he was hostile to linguistics in general. When McKeon and Hutchins referred to *linguistics* and

spoke of their desire to see linguistics prosper and form an essential part of the University of Chicago's program in the Humanities, they were undoubtedly sincere, but were referring to linguistics in the most general sense.

Nor can one accuse McKeon and Hutchins, in retrospect, of having been "poor-mouthing", of having used the university's poor financial condition as an excuse for asking Bloomfield to simply "wait and see" whether they could give him the increase in salary, the relief from administrative duties, and the secretarial assistance which Yale was offering him. The University of Chicago was indeed in low water financially, as a result of the second wave of the Great Depression which hit the country in 1937 and 1938.

To what extent, we may also wonder, did Bloomfield have a long-standing animus against administrators in general, dating at least from the time he went to Chicago in 1927, and perhaps even earlier? He defended himself against such a possible interpretation of his position in a post-card he sent to J. Milton Cowan on January 11, 1943:

"Some of my best friends are" administrators (2 big deans among them & I exchange jokes etc. with 2 lesser presidents). I get mad at administrators only when they grossly oppose science or education, or when they injure me or my colleagues, or when they behave insolently. (Why do they so often? Feelings of higher rank?)

In any case, the die had been cast. Bloomfield and his wife set out for New Haven in September of 1940, after the end of that year's Linguistic Institute. What they had not reckoned with, however, was the extent and intensity of Goodie's extreme attachment to and dependence on her Chicago environment and circle of friends.

CHAPTER 5

YALE

(1940-1949)

CHAPTER 5

YALE (1940–1949)

As the Bloomfields were en route from Chicago to New Haven in mid-September of 1940, tragedy struck again. Goodie was unable to stand the psychological wrench of separation from her Chicago environment, and had a mental breakdown from which she never recovered. When they arrived at New Haven, they stayed at the Hotel Taft, in the centre of town, preliminary to finding a house. In the event, they stayed at the Taft, with their furniture in storage, at least until Bloomfield had a stroke in 1946. She remained quiet but permanently depressed, so that they did not circulate together in social groups at all. Kenneth McKenzie, whom Bloomfield had known at Illinois (cf. Chapter 2), and his wife also had a suite at the Taft, but I do not know whether there was any contact between the two families. Léon Després reports that later, perhaps on some occasion when Bloomfield returned briefly to Chicago, the latter said “If I had known how much this would disturb Alice, I would not have left the University of Chicago”. Had Bloomfield not gone to Yale, American linguistics would not have had the short-term benefit it derived from his presence and activities there during the war-years. On the other hand, he might conceivably have been spared the excessive strain caused by both his war work and his wife’s breakdown, and he might have lived an active life for ten or more years longer. However, one of the few memorable dicta of the late unlamented Benito Mussolini was “History knows no if’s”.

During his first year and a half at Yale, Bloomfield gave courses and lectures, and guided graduate students, according to the normal pattern of American university-life. One of the few graduate students in linguistics was William G. Moulton (b.1914), who had begun a thesis on Swiss German dialectology under Prokosch. Moulton has described in detail his first contacts with Bloomfield, whom he found “warm, friendly, immensely patient, and perhaps even more shy than I”. Moulton brought Bloomfield what he thought was the final draft of his thesis, but found that, with infinite patience,

Bloomfield read it all, made innumerable comments, and even rewrote a large part of one chapter. With less brilliant students, however, Bloomfield was not always so patient. William J. Gedney (b.1915) reported that, on one Yale student's term paper, Bloomfield wrote, by way of comment, only "You get things mixed up". This would hardly have made matters clearer for the student or helped him to avoid further confusion.

One remark of Bloomfield's casts light on his attitude toward economic matters. He advised Moulton "Never pay to have anything you write published, but pay for the publication of your dissertation if you have to".* This is in line with the advice he gave me, when I was looking for a job in the depression year of 1936, to pay attention only to the salary offered me, not to the rank. (This was the exact opposite of my father's advice, which was to be heedful of the rank, rather than of the salary. Actually, of course, both are relevant, especially with one's first job.)

During his years at Yale, Bloomfield continued his work on the Algonquian languages, and also returned briefly to Philippine linguistics. He was on the staff of the 1941 Linguistic Institute, held at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, with courses on general linguistics and field methods. He also had an old Menominee woman come, to be a source of information. I saw him and his Menominee informant several times, sitting together and conversing. He used to refer to his control of Menominee in a very deprecatory fashion, as if it were quite imperfect. Several persons have stated, however, that in actual fact he was very fluent in the language. He used to speak of his wish that it had been possible to take down, in some way, the forms of Menominee that appeared in rapid conversation, since they of course differed somewhat from those obtainable at a slower pace. Unfortunately, this was just before effective tape recording became generally available. He continued work on his Menominee grammar, which remained incomplete at the time of his stroke in 1946.

Bloomfield's brief return to Malayo-Polynesian bore fruit in a highly condensed article on the syntax of Ilocano, the language of Ilocos Norte in the Philippines. It is only eight pages long, but is a veritable *tour de force*, worthy of Panini himself, in its compression of the entire taxonomic syntax of the

* It seems that in those days Yale required its Ph.D. graduates to have their dissertations published as is customary, indeed obligatory, in Germany for instance.

language into that short space. It was done as part of the newly started School of Modern Oriental Languages and Civilizations, but was Bloomfield's only contribution to that undertaking.

At Yale there was a very active Linguistics Club, with meetings once a month. They were usually attended by a fairly large audience, with hearers of all university ranks from graduate students to full professors, coming from both New Haven and other centres within a range of fifty to seventy-five miles. My wife Frances and I went there regularly from Providence, Rhode Island (where I had gone in 1940 to teach at Brown University), as did also Hans Kurath, Bernard Bloch, and members of the Linguistic Atlas staff. The greatly lamented Benjamin Lee Whorf (1897–1941) came regularly from Hartford until he was carried off prematurely by cancer. Quite a number of linguists came every month from New York, both long-established American scholars like E. Adelaide Hahn (1893-1967) of Hunter College, and European refugees such as Albrecht Goetze (1897–1971), Wolf Leslau (b.1906), and (among the younger scholars) Henry M. Hoenigswald (b.1915). The talks at the Club's meetings covered all ranges of linguistic investigation, both historical and descriptive, and ranging widely in the choice of languages covered. It is worth emphasizing that, at that time as earlier, American scholars were actively interested in the most recent developments in linguistic theory, especially at Prague and Copenhagen. On one occasion, before he developed his later hostility towards Román Jakobson (1896–1982) and European scholars in general, George Trager gave a very illuminating presentation of the theory of morphophonemics as set forth in the most recent publications of the 'Prague school'.

Bloomfield was of course present at virtually all of these meetings, gave talks, and took part in the discussion of the papers. His comments, always quiet and set forth in his usual unassuming manner, were listened to with the greatest respect, but no-one hesitated to express differing opinions on occasion. Although many of us (myself included) did not share all his views, he was nevertheless generally recognized as *il maestro di color che sanno*. We must emphasize, in view of later misrepresentations, that there was no such thing as a "Yale clique" or a "Bloomfield school", no cabal or "mafia", no orthodoxy enforced either overtly or covertly. What Bloomfield said of the Linguistic Society as it was in his time could also have been said of the Yale Linguistics Club:

Most plainly to be ascribed to the existence of our Society is our tendency towards cumulative progress. The younger workers [...] have started where the older workers left off. [...] Nowadays the older worker in linguistics often learns from the younger, and has the supreme professional satisfaction of knowing that the next generation is going forward from the frontiers of what is known today.

This was certainly true of Bloomfield himself, since he took over and applied in his own work some of the new discoveries and formulations developed by his juniors; and the rest of us took the same attitude. To Bloomfield and the immediately following generation, at least, the ideal of cumulative progress in science was valid in theory and was followed in practice. To them, the Kuhnian notion of competing “paradigms” did not apply.

When the Linguistics Club’s meetings were over, some of us, including Bloomfield, Sturtevant, the Sanskritist Franklin Edgerton (1885–1967) and others, would adjourn to a nearby “beer joint”, in a cellar, appropriately named the *Rathskeller*. Here we would continue the discussions begun at the club meeting, or talk about other matters. My wife Frances described the conversation at one of these gatherings as involving “Edgerton laying down the law about Sanskrit, Sturtevant playing the ‘gay dog’ with one or more of the ladies, and Bloomfield off in a corner with Adelaide Hahn teaching her the plural of *sonofabitch* (“sonofabitches”, not “sonsofabitch”). On another occasion, Bloomfield gave us a long harangue about Yiddish (the only time I ever heard him use that term rather than his usual *Judeo-German*): how it was nothing but a corruption of some vulgar Silesian dialect, with only three hundred words, showing all the special tendencies of the Jewish soul, and utterly unanalysable since it had no fixed sounds or other structural features. His hearers did not laugh, and it took me a long time to realize that this farrago of nonsense was a manifestation of his bitter humor directed at popular misconceptions concerning Yiddish and language in general.*

Another time, Bloomfield told us of a special session of the Linguistic Society, at its fourth annual meeting, in 1927, held at Nashville, Tennessee. According to his story, there was a session devoted to American Indian

* Léon Després’ sister, Mrs. Claire Després Oppenheim, and Mrs. Sally Zimmermann inform me that, at some time during the 1930’s in Chicago, Bloomfield “discovered” Yiddish and for a while investigated it with great interest and enthusiasm.

languages, at which he, Sapir, and Michelson were to give papers. The three of them took a taxi from the centre of town out to a college where the session was to be held. On arriving there, they proceeded to the appointed room, and found no-one else present, nor did anyone else come. Each of them then read his paper to the two others, who discussed it, and then the three took a taxi back to the hotel downtown. On checking this story against the record of the actual meeting, we find that such a session was indeed held, at Scarritt College, some distance from the centre of town. It was not limited to Amerindian languages, however. There were seven papers altogether, with Bolling, Petersen, Kellogg, and Preveden as the others on the program. Bloomfield's version was more picturesque, but was clearly a "leg-pull", probably intended to emphasize the low esteem in which he considered that the study of American Indian languages was held at the time.

The Second World War (or, perhaps better, the final spasm of the Thirty-One Years' War) was of course already under way, and, especially in the North-East, there was a growing feeling that the United States was going to be involved sooner or later, and on a global scale. Fortunately for the linguistic aspects of the United States' involvement (which still lay in the future), there was one man who realized that we were sure to need what he termed "a stockpile of strategic language competence": Mortimer Graves (1893-1982) of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS). This organization, which at that time had its headquarters in Washington, is a clearing-house and sponsor for the activities of its constituent societies, of which the Linguistic Society is one. Also fortunately, Roland G. Kent's successor as Secretary-Treasurer of the Linguistic Society was a young Germanist and phonetician, located at the University of Iowa at the time, named J Milton Cowan.* Cowan had met Bloomfield for the first time at the Society's summer meeting in 1937, had done some work on the Fox language, and had had correspondence with Bloomfield on that topic.

Beginning in 1943, the ACLS and the LSA coöperated in a joint effort to provide such a "stockpile of strategic language competence". This activity was named the Intensive Language Program, or ILP, and there was close collaboration between Graves and Cowan in its establishment. The after-effects

* The absence of a period (British English "full stop") after the letter J in Cowan's name is intentional, since that is the form in which his parents gave him that part of his name; his normal way of citing his name orally is "J, no period, Milton Cowan".

of the Depression were still being felt in the ranks of the linguists, a number of whom were without steady employment and were being subsidized by grants from such agencies as the ACLS. This was especially true of specialists in American Indian languages. Several such linguists were entrusted with the task of working on various languages which had previously either not been studied at all or had been poorly described and analysed. The reasoning behind this procedure was, as Cowan has phrased it, "that if these linguists he [Graves] had been giving grants to could analyse unwritten American Indian languages, they could certainly do other languages, and why not some likely to be of strategic importance?"

A pilot program was therefore set up, in which Mary R. Haas (b.1910), an Amerindianist then at the University of Michigan, who had not previously worked on Thai, ran a course in which some Thai students served as sources of information, and American students observed her procedures in learning how to elicit that information and analyse the language. At the same time, she incorporated this information into teaching materials to be used in class. In this method, the rôle of teacher was split in two: the native speaker served as a source of knowledge and acted as a model for the learners to imitate, and the linguist analysed the material and accelerated the learning process by explaining the linguistic structure of the target language. In some instances, the linguist was also starting from scratch, but normally gaining knowledge much faster than the students.

Immediately after the United States became embroiled in the war in December of 1941, the ILP was greatly expanded and set moving "in high gear". Cowan moved to Washington and was active in organizing the civilian side of the work. On the military side, the United States was fortunate in having a young linguist, Lieutenant (later Major) Henry Lee Smith, Jr. (1913–1974), first to persuade the "top brass" of the Army that this work needed to be done, and then to coöperate with the ILP in getting it done and the resultant materials (learning-manuals, discs, etc.) distributed to where they were needed. The original plan of the ILP was to have a relatively small program established, under the supervision of trained linguists, at a few universities, to teach the various target languages to highly selected soldiers. The Army authorities, however were so enthusiastic over the initial successes of the pilot programs that they decided to expand the language aspect of the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) far beyond what was originally intended, at a

great number of universities and often under the direction of foreign language teachers who knew little or no linguistics. Nevertheless, the ASTP language-programs were so successful as to arouse a great deal of attention in the popular press, often with considerable misunderstanding and misrepresentation. It came to be widely believed that the approach used in the ASTP had been developed by the Army, so that it was frequently called "the Army method", although it had actually been developed in the ILP.

This description of the ILP and of the application of its approach to the wartime problems of language teaching has been necessary for the reader's understanding of Bloomfield's involvement in it. At first, he was consulted on occasion, but had no active part in the pilot projects which we have mentioned. The situation changed when work began in earnest on the preparation of teaching manuals on what was termed the "Second [i.e. intermediate] Level". It was decided to have "Second Level" manuals prepared for twenty-seven different languages, and a corresponding group of linguists (most of them in their twenties and thirties) were entrusted with the task. Among these languages was Dutch, for which Bloomfield was asked to prepare a manual. With typical Bloomfieldian energy, he fell to work immediately, simply following his own thoroughly justified convictions as to the proper method, but before any detailed guide lines had been set or any other manuals prepared which could serve as models. He worked with a native speaker of Dutch, and in 1942 and 1943 prepared a book entitled *Colloquial Dutch*.

In late 1942 and early 1943, work had begun in Washington on the preparation of what was intended to serve as a model manual, *Spoken Spanish*, to be written jointly by the Chicago phonetician Salomón Narciso Treviño (1897-1983) and the Sapir trainee Morris Swadesh (1909-1967) as his Army counterpart. A less mutually compatible combination could probably never have been found. The resultant manual was unimaginative, uninspiring to the learner, and (because of Treviño's hostility to any kind of structural approach) incredibly conservative and stick-in-the-mud in its grammatical aspects. The Italian manual, a much better job, was done by Vincenzo Cióffari (b.1905). The preparation of these manuals was entrusted to the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI), with the four Romance languages (French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese) being done at the USAFI's branch in Washington, and other languages elsewhere. The manuals for the Romance lan-

guages were published for civilian use by D. C. Heath & Co. of Boston and the others by Henry Holt & Co. of New York City.

Of the other manuals, several were to be prepared at Yale: Russian by George L. Trager, Burmese by William S. Cornyn (1906–1971), German by William G. Moulton and his wife Jenni, and Japanese by Bernard Bloch and Eleanor Harz Jorden. When the first learning-units of *Spoken Spanish* were sent to Yale, the universal reaction was one of disbelief and contempt. It took several weeks of conferences and discussions, in Washington and New Haven, to persuade the Yale group to go ahead with the manuals. The *Spoken Italian*, although also quite conservative, was much more solid and dependable than the *Spoken Spanish*. Bloomfield finished his *Colloquial Dutch* and then prepared a wholly different *Spoken Dutch*. He followed closely the basic pattern of the “Second Level” manuals and used the *Spoken Italian* as a model, though by no means slavishly following its dialogues word for word. In 1944, after the Washington USAFI office had been closed and its personnel moved to 165 Broadway, New York, the *Spoken Dutch* was “edited” there, with a certain amount of unauthorized rewriting. When the printer’s proofs were sent to Bloomfield, he “hit the ceiling” and was very angry. Cowan succeeded in mollifying him by arranging to have the *Colloquial Dutch* (which was in reality a much better job) to be published as well as the *Spoken Dutch*, in the series of ACLS-sponsored manuals. Hence the anomaly that that series contains two books on Dutch, both by Bloomfield.

At the same time as work was getting under way on the language manuals in 1942, Bloomfield was asked to prepare a more general exposition of how a learner should set about learning a language. This he did in a short brochure of sixteen pages, *Outline Guide for the Practical Study of Foreign Languages*. At the same time, Bernard Bloch and George Trager prepared a companion work, slightly longer (82 pages), *Outline of Linguistic Analysis*. For this latter book, Bloomfield wrote the first draft of part of the chapter on morphology, and all of that on syntax. Both were published by the Linguistic Society in 1942. In his *Outline Guide*, Bloomfield treats primarily the best ways to obtain information concerning any given language from a native speaker, and also points out the dangers and pitfalls facing an investigator, especially in the temptation to ask the native speaker theoretical questions about the language instead of eliciting actual speech-forms.

During the academic year 1943–1944, there were several ASTP groups of soldiers at Yale, working in language and area programs devoted to such languages as Russian (with Trager as director), Burmese (Cornyn), and Italian (myself). There were difficulties with the Russian from the start. A biologist of Russian origin named Petrunkevich, who specialized on spiders, obtained, in some way, copies of one or more of the lessons that Trager had prepared for Russian. Petrunkevich became furious over the way in which Trager had presented its structure, and accused him of committing rape on the body of the Russian language. Petrunkevich considered that he was qualified as an authority on the matter, because one of his classmates in school had become an outstanding poet. The phonetic transcription, especially, enraged Petrunkevich, who declared that “only Odessa Jews talk that way”. His criticisms were unfounded, nonsensical, and rabid, but he raised a tremendous ruction with the Yale University authorities. Bloomfield, Sturtevant and Edgerton had to waste many valuable hours on writing letters to the administration in reply to Petrunkevich’s ravings (that is not too strong a term), pointing out their lack of foundation and defending Trager.

This was simply one of the various difficulties that Trager had in the running of the Russian ASTP. Matters came to a head in early 1944, when Trager abruptly left Yale (whether of his own volition or not, I do not know) and went to a wholly different job in Washington, with the Board on Geographical Names. This turn of events immediately brought on a crisis in the running of the ASTP Russian program and in the preparation of the *Spoken Russian*. Bloomfield had studied some Russian, but not much; Edgerton knew a fair amount. They managed to keep the language and area program going until all the ASTP men were suddenly pulled out in April of 1944. The *Spoken Russian* was a considerably greater source of trouble. Trager’s first language had been Russian, spoken in his family in Newark, New Jersey, but it had been replaced by English (which he spoke with a typical northern New Jersey accent) when he was still a small child. Nevertheless, he was under the delusion that his Russian was as good as any native speaker’s. As Bloomfield observed to Cowan, Trager would consult one or more native speakers to elicit a given form, and would then discard whatever accurate information he had obtained from them and replace it by his own, inaccurate form he thought he remembered from his childhood or had formed by analogy. Consequently, he introduced into his text a great many features which were simply not Russian. After Trager’s departure, Morris Swadesh was asked to continue with the

writing of the *Spoken Russian*, since he too thought himself a “native speaker” of the language. In actuality, he was in the same position as Trager and, into the units which he prepared, he introduced still more non-Russian features.

A major rescue operation had, therefore, to be undertaken. It was entrusted primarily to Bloomfield, who worked very energetically at it. He was assisted chiefly by a true native speaker, Luba Petrova, the best of the group of drill masters in the ASTP’s Russian-program. For the grammatical discussions, Bloomfield turned for help to Román Jakobson, who was at that time in New York. The relations between the two were cordial, and Jakobson furnished Bloomfield with a great deal of useful information. By this time, the first twelve units of *Spoken Russian* were at the stage of printer’s proof, and phonograph recordings had already been made. Little could be done to correct the errors they contained, except to put at the bottom of the page an embarrassed statement, for the worst of the boners, that they were wrong and that authentic Russian speakers would phrase the particular expression differently.

Under these circumstances, Bloomfield was willing to have himself and Luba Petrova named on the title-page of the second part of *Spoken Russian*, but not on that of the first twelve units (which had been issued separately). He therefore invented a pseudonym to cover the contributions which had been made by all those involved in preparing that part of *Spoken Russian*. One of the sections of each learning unit in the “Second Level” manuals was a group of review dialogues, which the learner was supposed to consider as if he had overheard native speakers conversing among themselves. Taking his cue from a radio-program of the time, Swadesh invented, for these dialogues, the name “Listening in”. On the basis of this term, Bloomfield devised the pseudonym *I. M. Lesnin*, an approximation of a Russian’s pronunciation of “I am listening”.

This was not enough for the copyright authorities in the Library of Congress, who insisted on having I. M. Lesnin’s dates, citizenship, current address, and so forth. To meet these requirements, Bloomfield concocted another of his “small mythologies”. Joos reports that Bloomfield, together with Bloch and others, prepared a fictional biography of Prof. Ignatius Mendeleeff Lesnin, with U.S.S.R. citizenship and domiciled in the U.S.A. His address was given, in the jocular correspondence between Bloomfield and Cowan, as

Marsh Mountain State Penitentiary in Minnesota, but he could be reached through his mother, Miss Sally Clapp, the "madam" of a house of ill repute known as "Sally's Place" in Kansas City. Other details were given in a biographical account which, according to Joos, has not survived.

In those times, with the outcome of the war still uncertain, and with almost everybody subjected to unusual stress and strain, nerves were inevitably on edge and tempers frayed. Matters were not helped by the presence on our shores of certain refugee scholars who had come to this country with already well-developed persecution complexes, which they nourished and inflated here to an even greater extent. One of the worst offenders in this respect was Leo Spitzer, who had come from Germany, by way of Turkey, to the Hopkins in 1936. Especially in the first ten years of his American sojourn, he picked quarrels with a great many scholars, often over picayune details and manifesting his hostility towards his new environment in the country which had given him refuge. He was strongly in favor of a "mentalist" approach in linguistic matters, and decried all efforts to make linguistics a science.

The lowest point in Spitzer's series of diatribes was reached in 1943, in a long footnote to an article in *Modern Language Quarterly*, containing violent attacks against Bloomfield, Bloch, John Flag Gummere (b.1901), and the Linguistic Society. Although Bloomfield in general avoided polemics, Spitzer's insults proved too much for him to leave unanswered. Over the years, Bloomfield had collected a number of unintelligent observations concerning language (which he termed "stankos") made by ignorant and stupid people. Around these, he built his article "Secondary and tertiary responses to language", published in 1944. He distinguished between objective and irate responses, using almost exclusively the latter type of "stankos" for his exemplifications. At the end of the article, he reproduced Spitzer's long footnote in full as "an illustration perfect in every detail" of all the misrepresentations and distortions of the "mechanistic" position he had been discussing. Spitzer's way of replying was to publish a further article containing no new arguments but only repeating his previous insults, on a purely personal level.

The ASTP language-program attracted a lot of attention in the American press in late 1943 and in 1944, with considerable emphasis on the rôle of the linguist in analysing the language and in directing the students' work with the native speaker. *Time* magazine published an article on this topic, mentioning

Bloomfield's connection with the program at Yale and characterizing him as "graying" and "tweedy" (a favorite journalistic adjective for describing university-professors). Some linguists, such as Mary R. Haas working on Thai and Charles F. Hockett (b.1916) on Chinese, had begun their study and teaching without prior knowledge of the target language. The achievements of these scholars were given, if anything, an exaggerated amount of publicity. With a modicum of ill will, this phenomenon could be twisted (as it was by some enemies of the ASTP program) into an allegation that it was a requirement that the linguist in charge should not know the language he or she was dealing with. It is not known on what basis one might justifiably have ascribed this allegation to McKeon, but on September 27, 1943, Bloomfield wrote to Cowan:

It seems that McKeon of Chicago opposes present work in language teaching because it requires that the instructor knows nothing of the language to be taught. I hear he has informed the Assn of Am. Universities. One gathers that we arranged the bombing of Pearl Harbor so as to have the opportunity to do this kind of work.

During my year at Yale (1943–1944) in charge of the Italian ASTP-work, I had an unfortunate falling-out with Giuliano Bonfante (b.1904), who was then at Princeton. In the course of our correspondence, he expressed contempt for Bloomfield's *Language*, because (among other reasons) the latter's chapter on dialectology showed total ignorance of linguistic geography (!); because Bloomfield did not deal with meaning (!); and because Saussure's 1916 *Cours* was not mentioned in the book (!). I told Bloomfield of these statements, which Bonfante kept repeating both in personal contacts and in his publications, giving them wide currency in immediate post-war Europe. Bloomfield wrote to Cowan on January 15, 1945, in an obviously bitter vein:

Denunciations are coming thick and fast. I expect to be completely discredited by the end. There is a statement going round that de Saussure is not mentioned in my *Language* text book (which reflects his *Cours* on almost every page). Also that it does not deal with *meaning* — it seems there is no chapter on this topic. I do not intend to give any recognition to falsehoods of this kind, or to discourses which contain them or are based on them.

Actually, of course, Chapter 9 of Bloomfield's *Language* is entitled "Meaning" and presents his views on that topic, before he passes to the other aspects of linguistic structure. Bonfante's denigration of Bloomfield's chapter on dialect geography was due to the fact that the latter makes no mention of the "linguistica spaziale" of Bonfante's mentor Matteo Giulio Bàrtoli (1873–1946).

Saussure's *Cours* is indeed listed in Bloomfield's bibliography, as Bonfante would have found if he had looked under *de Saussure* rather than under *Saussure* alone. (Did he know that there was a *de* in front of the Geneva linguist's family-name? In Italian alphabetical listings family-names preceded by *de*, *di* or *da* are always listed under *D*.)

During all this time, Goodie continued in her state of what proved to be a permanent and incurable depression. At first, Bloomfield refused to have her given any psychiatric treatment, because of his anti-mentalist and basically anti-psychological views. When the situation became too obviously intolerable, she had to be institutionalized for a time. I have no information as to the specific dates involved, but she was in and out of hospital for the six years during which her husband was professionally active at Yale. When she was at the Taft, they apparently had their meals at the hotel's restaurant. Frances Sayers tells us:

Dr. Adelaide Hahn, a member of the Linguistics group whom I had first met at the Bloomfields', once spoke to me about Alice and Leonard, saying she had once observed Leonard on coming home from the University, embracing Alice and she him with such fervor. "They were like a pair of young lovers", she said. I too had caught the scene from time to time, always to be moved by it.

There was an elderly couple who lived at the hotel, and it was evident that the husband devoted all his energy and thought to the comfort of his frail wife. The Bloomfields did not know him beyond the "Good morning" and "Good evening" they spoke to each other as they passed in the lobby. One day, Leonard told me, the man came up to him and said "You and I are the great lovers, you know". That was all he had to say.

Even with all the extraordinarily heavy strain of excessive work with which he was burdened at the University, and with his emotion-draining domestic situation, Bloomfield still found time for at least some relaxation. William G. Moulton tells how, at some point in those years (perhaps in the spring of 1942), Bloomfield suggested that the two of them meet once a week to read some of the Old High German life of Christ written by Otfrid. In the course of these meetings, Bloomfield introduced the young Moulton to just about everything that had been written on Otfrid. One suspects that these meetings served Bloomfield as a means of (at least temporary) escape from the strains and stresses of his professional and domestic life, back into what was, after all, his chief field, Germanic philology.

Bloomfield also gave considerable rein to his sense of humor, even in these latter difficult times. A large part of his "small mythology" about I. M. Lesnin (p.72) was expressed in private communication between him and Cowan in their joking relationship. On a visit to Yale, Cowan was told by Bloomfield that Lesnin had gone to visit his mother in Kansas City, had taken Yale's only copy of *Spoken Spanish* with him intending to study it on the trip, and had left it there. If Cowan wanted to telephone, the number of "Sally's Place" was WASS-606-4-U. One day in June, 1945, Cowan received an envelope addressed in pencil to 'Proffessor J. Milton Cohwn'. It contained a letter, scrawled in pencil in an obviously disguised version of Bloomfield's handwriting, with the following text:

K.C., June 14 1945.

Dere Proffessor Cohn,

This here Spannish Second Levil you poeple got all het up about it one of the girls foun 1 peice here what wasnt out there, and it ant been used, so i thoght i would send it to you she swore she ant used it for nothing except put it on her beuro when she was getting dresed up for customers times is good and there is lots of thim comming in. Two bad the gent left it us not nowing nothing about it was wanted important and the Sears Roebuck cattalgue just used up.

Yours truly,

Sallie Clapp.

I mean this here kind of peice not busyness.

Enclosed was a tattered lipstick- or rouge-smeared, mimeographed sheet of the USAFI Spanish material.

For linguistic or other reasons, not all present-day readers can be expected to grasp the detailed references in Bloomfield's spoof. (I had to have "606" explained to me, as have all others whom I have asked whether they understood it or not.) The name *Clapp* suggests the old expression *the clap* for 'gonorrhea'. The telephone-number of "Sally's Place", WASS 606-4-U, suggests the Wassermann-test for syphilis, and a kind of salve that was supposed to aid in curing that disease, "Salvorsan 606", "for you". The expression "out there" and the reference to a Sears Roebuck catalogue imply that the *Spoken Spanish* material had been taken to an outdoor toilet, to

function as toilet-paper (for which old mail order catalogues were often used). In the postscript, *piece*, in the context of the whore-house's "business", is a slang term for 'act of coitus'.

In a letter to Cowan dated September 11, 1945, Bloomfield gave a further indication of his opinion of *Spoken Spanish*:

I have bad news: the K.C. people did not use the Spanish 2d Level as I said they had. It was a blind to cover up an insolent theft. They have sold it, apparently to a publisher named Heath. They have even sold rights to the Army. If you can get Sally to send you a copy of that book, Army ed. or Heath, I will soak it in antiseptic and read it.

Another none too elegant *jeu d'esprit* was a story which Bloomfield liked to tell on himself. It involved a scene at an elegant society reception at the home of a New Haven dowager, Mrs. Hillhouse. Seeing that this lady had a bad cold, he offered her a cough-drop containing the medicinal element horehound. Instead of saying, as he had intended, "Won't you have some horehound, Mrs. Hillhouse?", he perpetrated a spoonerism, saying "Won't you have some hillhound, Mrs. Horehouse?". Actually, this was an old Yale joke, which (as many wits often do) Bloomfield had taken over and told as if it had been his own *lapsus linguae*.

As the "small mythology" about "Sallie Clapp" and the "Mrs. Hillhouse" joke show, Bloomfield was thoroughly aware of the "facts of life" and ready to make — in private — jokes about them, often very sly ones. Some time in 1944, I had lent Bloomfield a copy of *How To Read Two Books*, by "Erasmus J. Addlepate". (This was a parody of *How To Read A Book*, a very ponderous tome by the philosopher Mortimer J. Adler.) In Chapter 2, "How To Read in Bed", Addlepate says:

Twin beds even hint at a certain preference for distance if not mutual distaste. So frequently Sumner's *Folkways* is ignored in a study of this sort.

This passage amused Bloomfield greatly, and not once, but several times he repeated it to me, with a grin and a sly poke of the elbow, when we met in the corridor of Yale's Hall of Graduate Studies. A similar type of humor is evident in his frequently-cited remark, in his 1933 *Language*, that "*He married a lemon* forces us to the transferred meaning only because we know that men do not go through a marriage ceremony with a piece of fruit". (Was Bloomfield

making a covert reference here to the colloquial use of *fruit* for “male homosexual”? If so, his observation would not be valid any longer, in times when “homosexual marriages” are celebrated.)

Of course Bloomfield gave rein to his sense of humor with regard to imaginary languages. Here, too, he liked to construct mythologies, though only small ones (unlike his contemporary J. R. R. Tolkien [1892–1973], who constructed entire language-structures with their accompanying lexicons, cultures, and histories). To one imaginary language he gave the name *Corsssett*, with the medial /s/ pronounced at least three times as long as it is normally spoken in English. Hockett, citing Bloch, describes Bloomfield’s playing a game with one of his imaginary invented languages, especially on long train-rides, to fill in the time:

Bloomfield would be an informant, and the others would try to elicit and transcribe data. The elicitation was particularly slow: before he could tell how to say ‘Good morning!’ he would have to know whether it was a man or a woman speaking, to an addressee older or younger than the speaker, on the north or the south side of the street, and so on endlessly. In the course of an hour or so ten or twelve items would be elicited. Forms with similar meanings would show the weirdest possible differences in shape. But no matter how many repetitions were called for, and no matter with what delay, there was complete consistency as to both sound and meaning.

Another, less extensive bit of linguistic tomfoolery, in which Bloomfield was a main participant, was what we termed the “-heimer-language”. It was not a full language, but simply a minor pattern of jocular word-formation. A group of five or six linguists (usually including Bloomfield, Bloch, Edgerton, Cornyn, Sturtevant and myself) would repair for lunch to a restaurant near the Hall of Graduate Studies. There we would amuse ourselves by inventing new formations on English words, using the suffix -heimer. Some radio announcer had popularized the coinage *wisenheimer* for ‘wiseacre’, and on this model Bernard Bloch’s father had formed *vitenheimer* for ‘vitamin’. The pattern struck first Bernard’s fancy and then that of Bloomfield and the rest of us. Bloomfield worked out an exact formulation of its basic principles:

- 1) For a common noun (simplex or compound) of two or more syllables:
 - a. With one exception, the final syllable or part thereof is replaced by -en- and the suffix -heimer is added: e.g. *fountain-pen* + -heimer > *foun-*

tenheimer; similarly, *morpheme* + *-heimer* > *morphenheimer*, *(re)frigerator* > *fridgenheimer*, *auto* > *autenheimer*, *bibliography* > *biblioggenheimer*. In the last-mentioned, *-el-* could also occur instead of *-en-*: *biblioggelheimer*.

b. Exceptionally, , with *ash-tray*, the element added was *-baker* : *ashen-baker* (obviously reflecting German *Aschenbecher* "ash tray").

2) With proper names, the element *-meyer* was added, preceded by *-en-* (or, where *-l-* was present in the resultant formation, *-el-* : *Churchill* > *Churchenmeyer*, *Trager* > *Tragenmeyer*, and, of course, *Hitler* > *Hittelmeyer*.*

The work on the various Russian undertakings continued through 1945 and on into 1946, with the *misère* of correcting proof on the *Spoken Russian*. Apparently Bloomfield had some hope of collaborating with Jakobson on a grammar of Russian. But this ongoing hard work, together with the continuing problem of his wife's illness, took its toll of Bloomfield's health. Tragedy struck yet a third time, in that he had a disastrous stroke, on May 27, 1946. He lived on for nearly three years, dying on April 18, 1949. Bernard Bloch told the rest of the story in his obituary:

For eight weeks he lay unconscious; then by slow degrees he began to regain his faculties — but never all of them. After many months he was able to walk again, supported by a cane and a companion's arm. After yet more months of creeping improvement, interrupted by a series of minor strokes, he recovered so far as to be able to make short visits to his office in the Hall of Graduate Studies, where he would sit in a wheel-chair at his littered desk and chat with friends. He could do no work. His eyes had been permanently affected by his illness, and his memory was impaired. When he received the first number of *Language* for 1948, with its dedication to him, he was deeply touched, but he could not read it. For a time there was hope that he might one day be well enough to resume his teaching; then the slow improvement ceased, and his paralysis began to grow more general. During the last year of his life he grew steadily weaker, until, four months before his death, he was again confined to his bed. He died peacefully. For those who saw

* Of these nonce formations, a few, especially *vitenheimer* and *Hittelmeyer*, have survived in my family dialect. I do not know whether any other family has preserved any of them. My daughter Carol Erickson has extended the pattern in a few compounds, by adding *-enheimer* to the first part and *-enmeyer* to the second, as in *dishenheimer-washenmeyer*, or breaking a single word into two parts and treating them in the same way, e.g., *reefenheimer-fridgenmeyer*. Whether any of the formations of the "*-heimer-language*" will survive her generation remains to be seen.

him during the last three years of his empty survival, his death was not a new occasion for grief.

Persons who saw Bloomfield during this sad time have given similar reports. One scholar who visited Yale during that period and saw Bloomfield has told me that it was very difficult to hold a sustained conversation with him. Others who were in close contact with him at this stage of his life have referred to it as "those dreadful years" and have apparently found it impossible to put down their reminiscences in writing.

During the time Bloomfield was in hospital and for some time thereafter, he and his wife were guests in the home of friends, Professor Erwin Goodenough (1893–1965), of the Yale School of Religion, and Mrs. Goodenough. It is reported that the ailments of Bloomfield and his wife had an unfortunate reciprocal influence. Her depression was intensified by his enfeebled condition, and at the same time his recovery was impeded by her permanent melancholia.

For an over-all evaluation of Bloomfield's life and achievements, we can give the final word to Bernard Bloch:

Leonard Bloomfield was unfailingly generous, a devoted worker in the cause of truth, an unrelenting fighter against reaction and stupidity. Above all, he was humane. We shall remember him with admiration for his greatness as a man of science, with love for his greatness as a human being.

CHAPTER 6
POSTHUMOUS FORTUNE
(1949-1989)

CHAPTER 6

POSTHUMOUS FORTUNE

At his death, Bloomfield left a widow, two adopted sons, and an estate. Goodie lived on eight years more, dying on September 17, 1957. Mrs. Sayers reports that she continued living with the Goodenoughs, “devastated and depressed, but calm and tractable, with nurses to attend her around the clock. James visited her often with his wife, and I went frequently from New York to take her for walks”.

One modern, non-Aristotelian view of tragedy may be summed up in a slight variation on John Greenleaf Whittier’s well-known lines: *Of all sad words of tongue or pen , / The saddest are these: It need not have been.* The three major disasters that struck the Bloomfields were tragedies according to this definition. Need Marie have committed suicide? Need Leonard have misinterpreted McKeon’s attitude and left Chicago, thereby bringing on Goodie’s breakdown? Need he have overworked himself so drastically during the war years? Seen in this light, Mrs. Sayers’ final characterization of the relationship between the Bloomfields seems fully justified: “I see it now for what it was: a deep-running, noble, tender love story played against the backdrop of disasters, doom and despair”.

Of the two sons, Roger seems to have disappeared from sight. Léon Després reports that, although Alice Bloomfield had excluded Roger as a beneficiary from her Will, James agreed to share the income with him. James continued, at least for a time, in the Navy. His marriage, according to Mrs. Sayers, was to a New Haven girl, of enough social importance to rate a description in some detail in the *New York Times*, but turned out badly nevertheless.

Aside from the financial aspects of his (and later his wife’s) estate, Bloomfield left a considerable amount of unfinished or nearly finished work in

manuscript, chiefly in two fields: his studies on the Algonquian languages, and his materials for teaching reading. For the former works, his literary executor was the linguist-anthropologist Charles F. Hockett; for the second, the dictionary editor Clarence L. Barnhart (b.1900). Hockett devoted a great deal of time and effort to editing Bloomfield's manuscript materials into as definitive a shape as possible, arranging for their publication by various agencies, and seeing them through the press. In this way, it was possible for Bloomfield's *Ojibwa Texts* to be made generally available in 1957; his *The Menomini Language* in 1962; and his *Menomini Lexicon* in 1975. Hockett made photocopies of Bloomfield's unpublished hand-written lexica of Cree and of Fox available to Algonquianists, who in fact obtained ten or twelve of each, and a few copies were deposited in libraries or museums. Various of his works, especially *Language*, were reprinted several times, and received belated translations from the 1960's on.

Bloomfield's reading-materials were finally published in 1961, under the title *Let's Read*, with Clarence L. Barnhart as editor. Apparently, no commercial firm could be persuaded to take an interest in them, and they were brought out by the Wayne State University Press (hardly a good choice for wide distribution in the public schools!). This event was woefully belated, and brought Bloomfield's materials into the open about thirty years after their time. The two reviews that *Let's Read* received in the English-speaking world were both unfavorable, for different reasons. Yakov Malkiel (b.1914), in *Romance Philology* (a strange place for a discussion of elementary English reading texts!), showed no knowledge at all of the real-life conditions prevailing in American schools, and used *Let's Read* simply as a pretext for venting his spleen against Bloomfield's views of the relation between speech and writing.

The late Henry Lee Smith, Jr., in his review in *Language*, expressed regret that *Let's Read* had been published at all. In view of the fact that, whenever they were tried, Bloomfield's materials, or elementary reading texts based on the same approach, were highly successful, Smith's objection might seem unfounded, when taken out of its historical context. Smith was reviewing *Let's Read* at a time when more research had been done than in Bloomfield's day on effective methods of teaching reading in elementary schools. It had been done by coöperating groups of linguists, educationists, teachers, and psychologists. Bloomfield's basic principles were sound, Smith admitted, but the order in which the elements of reading were taught needed revision in view

of later findings. Unfortunately (as I know from personal experience in discussions with Bloomfield) his ingrained distrust and aversion towards educationists blocked him from ever being willing to undertake any such collaboration. As a result, *Let's Read* never attracted any attention from reading specialists, and has remained only as a forgotten backwater, a tragedy for the children who were thus deprived of the benefits of Bloomfield's insights into their needs.

For a quarter of a century after the appearance of Bloomfield's *Language* in 1933, it served students of linguistics on all levels as an excellent introduction for beginners and as a further stimulus to thought for workers on even the most advanced level. (Often enough, one or another of us would get a bright idea, thinking it novel and original, and would work it through to its logical conclusion — and then, on reading what Bloomfield had to say on the particular topic, would discover that the answer had been there all the time.) One of the most outstanding of American lexicographers, Frederic Gomes Cassidy (b.1907), has stated:

As a very green graduate student at Ann Arbor (Ph.D. 1938 under C. C. Fries), I never personally met Leonard Bloomfield, though he was always present at meetings of the Linguistic Society (which I joined in 1937), and I heard him speak many times. In my own study of language, the two figures who influenced me most were Otto Jespersen, from whom I learned to get grammar at the source, not from literature, and Bloomfield, whose *Language* appealed to me for its plain speaking, its orderly sparseness, its range, its objectivity. It was a safe guide against unsupported theorizing. It never confused surmise with science. That, at least, was the basis of its claim on me, and when I feel the need of clean asstringency, I go back to Bloomfield's *Language*.

This was certainly true of my own experience as well. When I began work on Melanesian Pidgin English (now known as Tok Pisin) in 1943, I read through a number of over-all discussions of language (those of Sapir, Jespersen, Saussure, Vendryès and others) to find an adequate approach to the analysis of this language, with its drastically reduced grammatical structure and lexicon. Bloomfield's *Language* was not only the sole source of a valid theoretical basis, but provided me with a suitable procedure for performing the analysis and formulating the results. This was because Bloomfield both proclaimed the necessity of analysing each language in terms of its own

inherent characteristics and furnished examples of how to do this on all levels of linguistic structure.*

It must be emphasized once more that there was no unified "Bloomfield school" or even "Yale school" in this period. Many linguists were influenced by Bloomfield to a greater or lesser extent, but maintained their independence of outlook and thought, as did (to name only a few) Charles C. Fries, Henry Lee Smith, Jr., W. Freeman Twaddell (1906–1982), and Raven I. McDavid, Jr. (1911–1984). A few carried one specific attitude of Bloomfield's to a wholly unjustified extreme. Not only Bloomfield, but other linguists of the time (e.g., G. M. Bolling, C. C. Fries) insisted rightly that the analysis of language should BEGIN with form, not meaning, and that meaning should of course be taken into account at all times, though not deferred until all problems of morphosyntax were solved. None of those I have just mentioned denied the basic importance of meaning in human communication.

A few members of the immediately following generation of American linguists — notably George L. Trager, Bernard Bloch, and Zellig S. Harris (b.1909) — interpreted this position as involving, not simply the priority of form over meaning in analytical procedure, but complete banishment of meaning from linguistics proper. This attitude was made most explicit in Harris's *Methods in Structural Linguistics* (1951), which was quite influential in the first few years after its publication. Even these extremists, however, regarded meaning as extraneous to linguistic structure only in theory. In practice, they admitted the use of meaning in the determination of distinctions between forms, as a "short cut". Nevertheless, many of their critics spread the notion, especially in Europe, that not only these few "post-Bloomfieldians", but all American linguists wanted to banish the study of meaning entirely from linguistics.

A reaction against Harrisian, Tragerian and similar varieties of structuralism was inevitable. In its initial form, beginning with the publication of the monograph *Syntactic Structures* of Avram Noam Chomsky (b.1928), the reform could have been incorporated into the over-all theory of linguistic structure without great difficulty, as a useful extension of principles already

* To show my gratitude, I wanted to dedicate the resultant book to Bloomfield. When I asked his permission, he replied deprecatingly that he would feel very much embarrassed — but he nevertheless gave me permission to do so.

present or implicit in current practice (particularly in syntax and some aspects of word formation). Unfortunately, factors of personality and of politics intervened, to turn this development into an attempt to overthrow all of the principles which Bloomfield and others had established in order to make linguistics, as far as possible, a science. Chomsky and his followers took what the late Carl and Florence Voegelin had called an "eclipsing stance", i.e., claiming that their approach was not only added to, but replaced all immediately preceding work. As a basis for the transformational-generative grammar which they developed, they asserted the validity of a "mentalistic" approach, with a circular definition of "mind" (language reflects the speaker's mind; the speaker's mind is what his or her language reflects). The Chomskyites maintained that their assertions concerning language were so well founded as to be immune to disproof by any type of scientifically discoverable evidence.

At a slightly later stage, in the middle 1960's, Chomsky developed a theory of "deep structure" of language, inaccessible to direct observation, deducible only from "surface" manifestations but determining the latter. The transformationalists based their analysis of all linguistic structure on that of English, thereby again forcing all languages into a Procrustean bed, just as earlier descriptions of American Indian and other non-Indo-European languages had been squeezed into the mould of Latin grammar. At the same time, in the 1960's, Chomskyan doctrine continued to separate meaning from language and to insist on an unrealistic absolute synchronicity. Chomsky's political stance during the "troubles" of the middle and late 1960's gained him a wide following among naïve, uncritical young people with no knowledge of any but their native language and no concept of scientific procedure. There arose a transformationalist mafia, of a type previously unknown in American linguistics, based on adherence to the doctrines of a charismatic guru with strongly political overtones.

It can easily be seen how widely the principles of the transformationalist school differed from those of any objectively based method, Bloomfieldian or other. The Chomskyan revolt was directed, initially, against Zellig S. Harris (who had been Chomsky's mentor at the University of Pennsylvania), C. C. Fries, and others who had tried to introduce a scientific method, as far as possible, into linguistics. Bloomfield's name was soon dragged into the polemics. Such unfounded accusations were hurled as that Bloomfield had "set

back the development of linguistics by fifty years". In their search for "respectable" antecedents, the Chomskyites went as far back as the seventeenth-century *Grammaire générale et raisonnée* of Antoine Arnauld (1612–1694) and Claude Lancelot (1615–1695), and the early nineteenth-century theories of Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835). They claimed to have discovered a more recent predecessor in Edward Sapir, whose psychologizing approach they contrasted with Bloomfield's "behaviorism", to the disadvantage of the latter. In actuality, Sapir's view of the scientific nature of linguistics and of the principle of regularity of sound change was very close to Bloomfield's, as they both recognized in their respective writings. This aspect of their relationship was of course neglected in the Chomskyites' anti-Bloomfieldian crusade. His view of science as a cumulative, positive, collaborative effort was replaced by a reinterpretation of linguistics and other sciences as following Kuhnian "paradigms", varying widely and often hostile to each other. In fact, as Martin Joos pointed out, Chomskyan transformationalism was not a "Copernican revolution" (as Chomsky's followers liked to call it), but simply a relatively minor variation within structuralism.

Consequently, in the 1960's and 1970's, Bloomfield's reputation was at a low ebb, due to the systematic denigration of his work emanating from the Chomskyan camp. With the commemoration of Bloomfield's centenary in 1987, however, and resultant reappraisals of his achievements, the climate of opinion is beginning to change. His true stature as one of the greatest linguists America has produced (together with Whitney and Sapir) is now being recognized, and is sure to be acknowledged more and more widely, in America and elsewhere, in times to come.

NOTES TO THE BIOGRAPHY
and
REFERENCES FOR NOTES

NOTES TO THE BIOGRAPHY

In these notes, we give references principally to the various persons and other sources from which we have obtained the information contained in the text. The author and year references are enumerated in detail in the list following these notes. "Bibliography" or "Bibl." refers to the *New Leonard Bloomfield Bibliography* at the end of the book.

For recent general discussions of Bloomfield's work and achievements, in addition to the essays contained in Hall (ed.) 1987, cf. Robins 1988; Hockett, forthcoming.

Notes to Chapter 1

Most of the information contained in this chapter was obtained from Léon M. Després, either in his article in Hall (ed.) 1987 or by personal communication (abbrev.: p.c.). Cf. also Bloch 1949 and the notes to the various obituaries reprinted in Hockett (ed.) 1970.

Maurice Bloomfield: Bolling 1928.

Bloomfield's accent in English: Joos 1987:13.

Bloomfield and Sayers families' relation to Judaism: Després, p.c.

Leonard Bloomfield's experiences in school at Elkhart Lake: Bloch 1949: 87; Joos 1987:18.

Parallel between Brahms and Bloomfield: Hall 1987a:67.

Pictures for *The Winter's Tale*; Després 1987:8.

Bloomfield on science and religion: Pike 1989:218.

Sapir and Judaism: Mandelbaum 1941.

Notes to Chapter 2:

Article on Hans Sachs: cf. Bibliography 1912a.

Requirement of year in Germany: Moulton 1970:515.

- Printing of *Introduction*:: information from files of Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York (p.c.)
- Bloomfield's year in Germany: Bloch 1949:88.
- Brahms' and Bloomfield's personalities: Hall, in Bibl. 1983.ii.
- Bloomfield's models for linguistic analysis: letter to Michelson in Hockett 1987:41.
- Panini's influence on Bloomfield: Rogers 1987; Emeneau 1988..
- Bloomfield's *Tagalog Texts*: Wolff 1987.
- Blake's review of Bloomfield's *Tagalog Texts*: cf. Bibliography, 1917.a.i.
- On Wundtian survivals in Bloomfield's analysis of Tagalog: Kess 1988:425-426.
- "Physigunkus": cf. Bibliography, 1918.
- Grover and Marie Bloomfield: Després 1987:4.
- Bloomfield's correspondence with Michelson: Hockett 1987:39-41.
- Letter to Carl Haessler reproduced by courtesy of Mrs. Frances C. Sayers (p.c.)

Notes to Chapter 3:

- Bloomfield's move to Ohio State: Hockett (ed.) 1970:536.
- Bloomfield's Algonquian studies: Hockett 1949; Goddard 1987.
- Correspondence between Bloomfield and Sapir: Hockett 1987:44-56.
- Bloomfield, Bolling, Sapir and the Linguistic Society: Esper *apud* Hockett (ed.) 1970:539; Joos 1986:3-7; Hockett 1987:44-46.
- Bloomfield, Weiss, and "objectivism" ("behaviorism"): Bloch 1944:89; Esper 1968, chapters 8, 9; Kess 1983:xxx-xxxi. Cf. also Bloomfield's letter to Sapir, in Hockett 1987:53. Was Bloomfield's "conversion" from the Wundtian to the Weissian approach sudden? — cf. Hockett, forthcoming. A badly misleading account, influential in its time and after: Schlauch 1946.
- Marie Bloomfield's suicide: Joos 1986:6; Després 1987:4.
- Grover Bloomfield's last years: Després 1987:5.
- Mrs. Bloomfield's mother's mental breakdown: Després 1987:5.
- "Bennison Gray" and linguistics as a science: Gray 1980, 1981; Hall 1981. Cf. also Sapir 1929.
- Influence of Saussure on Bloomfield: letter reproduced in Cowan 1987:29; cf. also Koerner 1989
- Bloomfield's conversation with gypsies: Sayers 1987:17.
- Bloomfield on teaching freshman German for a living: letter to Sapir reproduced in Hockett 1987:54.
- Mrs. Bloomfield's "protectiveness": Esper *apud* Hockett (ed.) 1970:538.

Further examples of Bloomfield's humor: Hockett (ed.) 1970:543; Després 1987:6–7.

The Bloomfields' trip to France and Italy in 1926: letters reproduced through courtesy of Mrs. Frances C. Sayers (p.c.)

Adoption of Roger Montour Bloomfield and James Sheldon Bloomfield: Després 1987:10 and p.c.; Sayers 1987:17–18.

Bloomfield's reading materials; cf. Bibliography, 1961.

Notes to Chapter 4:

The Bloomfields' residences in Chicago: Hockett (ed.) 1970:546; Després 1987:5–6.

Bloomfield's hold-up(s): Bloomfield, p.c. to the author.

Bloomfield and Sapir: C. F. Voegelin *apud* Hockett (ed.) 1970:539–540; Després 1987:8–9.

Sapir quotations: In Sapir 1921: on form-categories, 105; on Plato and Confucius, 234; on Algonkin words, 244; on Heine, 240.

Bloomfield quotation: cf. Bibliography 1933a:443.

Bloomfield's occasional "cutting remarks": cf. Metcalf 1988:297.

Letter to Dean Brumbaugh: University of Chicago Archives, reproduced by permission.

Bloomfield and the Linguistic Atlas: Joos 1986:31–32, 44.

Kloeke review: cf. Bibliography, 1928f.

Hermann review; cf. Bibliography, 1932b.

The Proto-Algonquian consonant-cluster */çk/: cf. Bibliography, 1928; also Geary 1941.

Bloomfield's 1933 *Language* as "my high-school-text": Bloch 1949:92.

Bloomfield and historical-comparative linguistics: cf. Hoengiswald 1987; Lehmann 1987.

Bloomfield and dialectology: Moulton 1987.

"Rehashed Saussure plus Watsonian behaviorism": as early as Devoto 1951; most recently Brincat 1986:237–238.

Criticism of Bloomfield's use of IPA phonetic symbols: Edgerton 1933; Kroesch 1933; Kent 1934:43–45.

European scholars' rejection of Neogrammarian doctrines: from Schuchardt 1885 and Gilliéron 1910, continuing through Bårtoli 1925 and Bonfante 1947 down to the present.

Bloomfield and meaning: cf. Koerner 1970 and, most recently, Hall 1987b; Robins 1988.

Letter to Pike: reproduced in Pike 1989:220.

- "Post-Bloomfieldians'" exclusion of meaning from linguistics: cf. most recently Robins 1988:69-70.
- Semantics of Roumanian neuter: Hall 1973; Bonfante 1986:387.
- Bloomfield and Linguistic Institutes: Joos 1986:65, 68, 69, 73, 74, 75, 78-79, 89, 90-91.
- Mrs. Bloomfield and Chicago milieu: Després 1987:6.
- Was there a marriage-contract? — Després, p.c.
- "If Hitler were to come to power": Després 1987:8.
- Bloomfield's personality: Bloch 1949:91; Hockett (ed.) 1970:541.
- Bloomfield, the Yale offer, and the University of Chicago administration: material in the University's Archives, reproduced by permission.
- Richard P. McKeon: cf. obituary in *Speculum* 61.764-765 (1986).
- Legend concerning McKeon's hostility towards Bloomfield: T. A. Sebeok, p.c. Cf. also Metcalf 1988:296-297.
- Bloomfield on administrators: card reproduced in Cowan 1987:26.
- Bloomfield's departure for Chicago: he was at the Linguistic Institute at Ann Arbor until mid-August (Joos 1986:93).

Notes to Chapter 5:

- Bloomfield's "If I had known ...": Després 1987:9.
- Bloomfield and graduate students: Moulton 1970:513-514.
- Merits of Bloomfield's article on Ilocano syntax: Wolff 1987:174.
- Cumulative progress in linguistics: cf. Bibl., 1946c.
- Bloomfield's interest in Yiddish: Mrs. Claire Després Oppenheim and Mrs. Sally Zimmermann, p.c.
- Nashville meeting of Linguistic Society; cf. report in *Lg.* 4.95 (1928).
- Linguistic Society, ACLS, Mortimer Graves, ILP and ASTP during war-years: Joos 1986: ch. 1; Cowan 1975. For Bloomfield's excellent exposition of the basic principles involved, cf. Bibl., 1945c.
- Bloomfield and manuals for Dutch: cf. Bibl. 1944a, 1944b, 1945a, 1945b. Cf. also Joos 1986:122-124.
- Bloomfield's *Outline Guide*: cf. Bibl. 1942a.
- Bloomfield and Jakobson: Halle 1988.
- "I. M. Lesnin": Cowan 1987:29.
- Spitzer's diatribe: Spitzer 1943:430-431. For his reply to Bloomfield, cf. Spitzer 1944.
- McKeon and language teaching: postcard reproduced in Cowan 1987:20-21, 35..

Bloomfield's acknowledgement of Saussure's influence: post-card reproduced in Cowan 1987:29.

Mrs. Bloomfield's condition: cf. Sayers 1987:20–21.

Moulton's and Bloomfield's study of Otfrid: Moulton 1970:322.

"Sally Clapp" and *Spoken Spanish*: Cowan 1987:30–31, 36–37.

How to Read a Book and *How to Read Two Books*: Adler 1940;

"Addlepatte" 1940.

Bloomfield's imaginary languages: Hockett (ed.) 1970:543.

The final three years: Bloch 1949:93–94.

Reciprocal influence on each other's illness: Prof. Erwin Goodenough, p.c.

Notes to Chapter 6

Mrs. Bloomfield's death date: L. Després, p.c.

Mrs. Bloomfield's condition: Sayers 1987:30.

James Bloomfield: Sayers 1987:28.

Bloomfield's reading materials and reviews thereof: cf. Bibliography, 1961.

Cassidy on Bloomfield: F. G. Cassidy, p.c.

The "post-Bloomfieldians": Hall 1969.

The "eclipsing stance" and the relations between Bloomfield's and others' approaches: Voegelin and Voegelin 1963.

Meaning in Chomskyan doctrines: cf. Hockett 1968:67–75.

Chomskyan search for antecedents: cf. Hall 1970; Koerner 1983.

REFERENCES FOR NOTES

As in the Bibliography of Bloomfield's works (see pages 105/107-117 below), we use the abbreviations which are customary for the major linguistic journals.

- Addlepate, Erasmus J. (pseud.). 1940. *How To Read Two Books*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co.
- Adler, Mortimer J. 1940. *How To Read A Book*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Bartoli, Matteo Giulio. 1925. *Introduzione alla Neolinguistica. (Principî – Scopi – Metodi)*. Genève: Olschki. (Biblioteca dell'Archivum Romanicum II.12.)
- Bloch, Bernard. "Leonard Bloomfield" [obituary]. *Lg* 25.87-98.
- Bolling, George Melville. "Maurice Bloomfield" [obituary]. *Lg* 4.214-217.
- Bonfante, Giuliano. 1947. "The Neolinguistic Position". *Lg* 23.344-375.
- 1986. "Ancora il neutro italiano e rumeno". *L'Italia Dialettale* 40.287-290.
- Brincat, Giuseppe. 1986. *La linguistica prestrutturale*. Bologna: Zanichelli.
- Cowan, J Milton. 1975. "Peace and War". *LSA Bulletin* 64.28-34.
- 1987. "The Whimsical Bloomfield". In Hall (ed.) 1987:23-37.
- Després, Léon. 1987. "Reminiscences of Leonard Bloomfield". In Hall (ed.) 1987:3-13.
- Devoto, Giacomo. 1951. *I fondamenti della storia linguistica*. Firenze: Sansoni.
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1933. Review of L. Bloomfield, *Language*. *JAOS* 53. 295-297.
- Emeneau, Murray Barnson. 1988. "Bloomfield and Pāṇini". *Lg* 64.754-760.
- Esper, Erwin Allen. 1968. *Mentalism and Objectivism in Linguistics: The Sources of Leonard Bloomfield's Psychology of Language*. New York: American Elsevier.
- Geary, James A. 1941. "Proto-Algonquian *čk : Further Examples". *Lg* 17.304-310.
- Gilliéron, Jules. 1919. *La faillite de l'étymologie phonétique*. Neuveville (Berne): Beerstecher.
- Goddard, Ives. 1987. "Leonard Bloomfield's Descriptive and Comparative Studies of Algonquian". In Hall (ed.) 1987:179-217.

- Gray, Bennison. 1980. "The Impregnability of American Linguistics: An historical sketch". *Lingua* 52.5-23.
- , 1981. "Can Linguistics Be?". *Lingua* 53.224-226.
- Hall, Robert A., Jr. 1969. "Some Recent Developments in American Linguistics". *NM* 70.192-227. — Repr. in Hall: *American Linguistics 1925-1969* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978), 62-97.
- , 1970. "Some Recent Studies on Port-Royal and Vaugelas". *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 12.207-233. — Repr. in Hall: *Linguistics and Pseudo-Linguistics* (Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1987), 9-31.
- , 1973. "The Semantics of the Rumanian Neuter". *Rumanian Studies* 3.189-193. — Repr. in Hall: *Language, Literature, and Life* (Lake Bluff, Illinois: Jupiter Press, 1978), 96-99.
- , 1981. "Can Linguistics Be a Science?". *Lingua* 53.221-224.
- , (ed.). 1987. *Leonard Bloomfield: Essays on His Life and Work*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. (SiHoLS, volume 47.)
- , 1987a. "Bloomfield the Man". In Hall (ed.) 1987:61-70.
- , 1987b. "Bloomfield and Semantics". In Hall (ed.) 1987:155-160.
- Halle, Morris. 1988. "The Bloomfield-Jakobson Correspondence, 1944-1946". *Lg* 64.737-754.
- Hermann, Eduard. 1932. *Lautgesetz und Analogie*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Hockett, Charles Francis. 1949. "Implications of Bloomfield's Algonquian Studies". *Lg* 24.117-131. — Repr. in Hockett (ed.) 1970:494-511.
- , 1968. *The State of the Art*. The Hague: Mouton. (= *Janua Linguarum*, Series Minor, no. 74.)
- , (ed.) 1970. *A Leonard Bloomfield Anthology*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press. — Repr., in abridged form, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- , 1987. "Letters from Bloomfield to Michelson and Sapir". In Hall (ed.) 1987:39-60.
- , Forthcoming. "Leonard Bloomfield: Fifty Years Later". To appear in *Yale Graduate Journal of Anthropology*.
- Hoenigswald, Henry M. 1987. "Bloomfield and Historical Linguistics". In Hall (ed.) 1987:73-88.
- Joos, Martin. 1975. "The Beginnings". *LSA Bulletin* 64.26-28.
- , 1986. *Notes on the Development of the Linguistic Society of America 1924 to 1960*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Linguistica.
- Kent, Roland Grubb. 1934. Review of L Bloomfield, *Language*. *Lg* 10.40-48.
- Kess, Joseph F. 1983. "Introduction". In reprint of L. Bloomfield, *Introduction to the Study of Language* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins), xvii-xxxviii..
- , 1988. Review of Hall (ed.) 1987. *HL* 15.296-297.
- Koerner, E. F. Konrad. 1970. "Bloomfieldian Linguistics and the Problem of 'Meaning'". *Jahrbuch für Amerikastudien* 15.162-183. — Repr. in Koerner,

- Toward a Historiography of Linguistics* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1978), 155-176.
- Koerner, Konrad. 1983. "The Chomskyan 'Revolution' and its Historiography". *Language & Communication* 3.147-169.
- 1989. "Leonard Bloomfield and the *Cours de linguistique générale*". In Koerner, *Practicing Linguistic Historiography*, 435-443. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kroesch, Samuel. 1933. Review of L. Bloomfield, *Language*. *JEGP* 39.594-597.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. 1987. "Bloomfield as an Indo-Europeanist". In Hall (ed.) 1987:163-172.
- Mandelbaum, David. 1941. "Edward Sapir". *Jewish Social Studies* 3.131-140. — Repr. in K. Koerner (ed.): *Edward Sapir: Appraisals of His Life and Work* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1984), 23-32.
- Metcalf, George J. 1988. Review of Hall (ed.) 1987. *GL* 28.295-297.
- Moulton, William G. 1970. "Bloomfield as Germanist". In Hockett (ed.) 1970:512-523.
- 1987. "Bloomfield as Dialectologist". In Hall (ed.) 1987:139-154.
- Paul, Hermann. 1880. *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*. Halle/S.: Max Niemeyer. (5th ed., 1920.)
- Pike, Kenneth L. 1989. "Recollections of Bloomfield". *HL* 16.217-225.
- Robins, Robert Henry. 1988. "Bloomfield the Man and the Man of Science". *TPS* 86.65-87.
- Rogers, David E. 1987. "The Influence of Pāṇini on Bloomfield". In Hall (ed.) 1987:89-138.
- Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co..
- 1925. "The Status of Linguistics as a Science". *Lg* 5.207-214.
- 1931. "The Concept of Phonetic Law as Tested in Primitive Languages by Leonard Bloomfield". In Stuart A. Rice (ed.): *Methods in Social Science: A Case Book* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 297-306. — Repr. in David G. Mandelbaum (ed.): *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture, and Personality* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1949), 73-82.
- Sayers, Frances Clarke. 1987. "The Small Mythologies of Leonard Bloomfield". In Hall (ed.) 1987:15-21.
- Schlauch, Margaret. 1946. "Early Behaviorist Psychology and Contemporary Linguistics". *Word* 2.25-36.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1885. *Über die Lautgesetze: Gegen die Junggrammatiker*. Berlin: R. Oppenheim.
- Silverstein, Michael. Forthcoming. "'Distinctive Features' in Leonard Bloomfield's Phonology".
- Spitzer, Leo. 1943. "Why Does Language Change?". *MLQ* 4.412-431.
- 1944. "Answer to Mr. Bloomfield". *Lg* 20.245-251.

Voegelin, Charles F., and Florence M. Voegelin. 1963. "On the History of Structuralizing in 20th Century Linguistics". *Anthropological Linguistics* 5:1.12-37.

A NEW LEONARD BLOOMFIELD
BIBLIOGRAPHY
(1909-1985)

A NEW LEONARD BLOOMFIELD BIBLIOGRAPHY

In Hall (ed.) 1987, C. F. Hockett and the present writer published an updated version of the bibliography of Bloomfield's publications which he had included in Hockett (ed.) 1970:xix-xxix. The present bibliography reproduces that version plus corrections and further material which had not been published by 1986.

As in the 1987 bibliography, we use the conventional bibliographical abbreviations, especially with regard to acronyms of linguistic journals, as established by the *Bibliographie Linguistique* / *Linguistic Bibliography*. Those which are not readily available or which have been introduced by the compilers are listed below.

Abbreviations for periodicals:

AC[n]IA	Atti del [n] Congresso Internazionale degli Americanisti
AJPs	American Journal of Psychology
IJaS	Inostrannye Jazyki v Shkole
JbGPh	Jahrbuch für germanische Philologie
MLF	Modern Language Forum
Monatshefte	Monatshefte für deutsche Sprache und Unterricht [later: für deutschen Unterricht]
MPhon	Le Maître Phonétique
P[n]CA	Proceedings of the [nth] International Congress of Americanists
SiL	Studies in Linguistics
StP	Studies in Phonology

Other abbreviations:

ed.	edited by ... : editor; edition
N	Notice by ...
R	Review by ...
repr.	reprint(ed in ...)
transl.	translation: translated by ...

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1909. "Before Dawn: a social drama" [Transl. of Gerhart Hauptmann: *Vor Sonnenaufgang* (1889). *Poet Lore* 20.241-315. [Also published separately, with unchanged pagination, Boston, The Gorham Press.]
- 1909/10. "A semantic Differentiation in Germanic Secondary Ablaut". *MPh.* 7.245-288, 345-382. [Also published separately, Chicago, 1909, 92 pp. — Repr. in part in 1970a:1-6.]
- 1911.a. "The Indo-European palatals in Sanskrit". *AJPh* 32.36-57. — Repr. in 1970.a.7-25.
- 1911.b. Review of Richard Loewe, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Leipzig: Götschen, 1910). *JEGP* 10.122-129.
- 1911.c. Review of Henrich Schroeder, *Ablautstudien* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1910). *JEGP* 10.131-135.
- 1911.d. Review of Francis A. Wood, *Indo-European a: α^i : α^u : A study in ablaut and in word-formation* (Strassburg: Trübner, 1905). *JEGP* 10.623-631. — Repr. in 1970a.16-39.
- 1912.a. "The E -Sounds in the Language of Hans Sachs". *MPh.* 9.489-509. [Dated Cincinnati, December 30, 1909.]
- 1912.b. "A type of Scandinavian Word-Formation". *PSASS* 1.45-53.
- 1912.c. "Etymologisches". *PBB* 37.245-261.
- 1912.d. Review of Wilhelm Braune, *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*, 3. und 4. Aufl. (Halle/S., Niemeyer, 1911). *JEGP* 11.269-274.
- 1912.e. Review of Alfred Dwight Sheffield, *Grammar and Thinking: A Study in the Working Concepts of Syntax* (New York & London: Putnam, 1912). *JEGPh* 11.619-624. — Repr. in 1970a:34-38.
- 1912.f. Review of Eduard Prokosch, *An Introduction to German* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1911). *Monatshefte* 13.92-94. — Repr. in 1970a:30-33.
1913. Review of Wilhelm Wundt, *Elemente der Völkerpsychologie: Grundlinien einer psychologischen Entwicklungsgeschichte der Menschheit*, 2. Aufl. (Leipzig: A. Kröner, 1913). *AJPs.* 24.449-453. — Repr. in 1970.a:39-43.
- 1914.a. *An Introduction to the Study of Language*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.; London: G. Bell: x, 335 pp. [For repr., cf. 1983.]
- i. R Tobias Diekhoff, *JEGP* 14.693-597 (1915).
 - ii. R George M. Bolling, *CW* 10.166-168 (1917).
 - iii. R Albert W. Aron, *AJPh* 30.86-92 (1918).
 - iv. R Albert W. Aron, *Monatshefte* 19.55 (1918).
- 1914.b. "Sentence and Word". *TAPA* 45.65-75 (published 1915). — Repr. in 1970a:61-69.
- 1914.c. [Abstract of 1914.b., with brief comment]. *JbGPh* 38.62 (1916).
- 1914.d. Review of Sigmund Feist, *Kultur, Ausbildung und Herkunft der Indo-Germanen* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1913). *JEGPh* 13.472-475.

- 1916.a.** "Subject and Predicate". *TAPA* 47.13-22 (published 1917). — Repr. in 1970a:70-77.
- 1916.b.** Review of Francis A. Wood, *Some Parallel Formations in English* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht; Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1913; of Elias Wessén, *Zur Geschichte der germanischen N-Deklination* (Uppsala: E. Berling, 1914); of Karl Karre, *Nomina agentis in Old English* (ibid., 1915); and of Henry Otto Schwabe, *The Semantic Development of Words for Eating and Drinking in Germanic* (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta, 1915). *JEGP* 15.140-144.
- 1916.c.** Review of Leo Wiener, *Commentary to the Germanic Laws and Medieval Documents* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1915). *JEGPh* 15.299-304. [Appended to Alexander Green's review of the same work, 293-299.]
- 1917.** *Tagđlog Texts with Grammatical Analysis*. 3 vols. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois. [Vol. 1: xv, 107 pp.; Vol. 2: xi, 183 pp.; Vol. 3: viii, 92 pp.] — Preface repr. in 1970a:78-81.
- i.** R. Frank R. Blake, *AJPh* 40.86-93 (1919).
- 1918.** "Physigunkus". *MPh* 15.577-602.
- 1922.a.** Review of Edward Sapir, *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech* (New York: Harcourt & Brace, 1921). *CW* 15.142-143. — Repr. in 1970a:91-94.
- 1922.b.** Review of Truman Michelson, *The Owl Sacred Pack of the Fox Indians* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921). *AJPh* 43.276-286. Repr. in 1970a:95-100. [Rejoinder by Truman Michelson, *AJPh* 44.285-286 (1923); repr. in Bloomfield 1970a:101.]
- 1922.c.** Review of Otto Jespersen, *Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1922). *AJPh* 43.370-373. — Repr. in 1970a:102-103.
- 1923.** *First German Book*. Columbus, Ohio: R. G. Adams & Co. vi, 362 pp. [2nd ed., 1928b.]
- 1924.a.** "The Menomini Language". *P[21]ICA* 1.336-343. [Actually printed later than October, 1925.]
- 1924.b.** Review of Ferdinand de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale*, 2nd ed. (Paris, Payot, 1922). *MLJ* 8.317-319. — Repr. in *CFS* 21.133-135 (1964) and in 1970a:106-108.
- 1925.a.** "Why a Linguistic Society?". *Lg* 1.1-5. — Repr. in 1970a:109-112.
- 1925.b.** "Call for the Organization Meeting". *Lg*. 1.6-7. [For the formation of the Linguistic Society of America, written by Leonard Bloomfield for a committee that included George M. Bolling and Edgar H. Sturtevant.]
- 1925.c.** "Notes on the Fox Language". *IJAL* 3.219-232. [Sections I-III.]
- 1925.d.** "Einiges vom germanischen Wortschatz". *Germanica: Eduard Sievers zum 75. Geburtstag*, 90-106 (Halle/S.: Niemeyer). — Repr. in 1970a:114-127.
- 1925.e.** "On the Sound System of Central Algonquian". *Lg* 1.130-156. [Footnote (p.130), repr. in 1970a:113.]

- 1926.** "A Set of Postulates for the Science of Language". *Lg* 2.153-164. [Summarized, with brief comments, in *JbGPh* 7.29 (1926).] — Repr. in *IJAL* 15.195-202 (1949); in *Readings in Linguistics* ed. by Martin Joos (Washington, D.C., American Council of Learned Societies, 1957; 4th ed., Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1966), 19-25, and in 1970a:128-140. Translations: French (1973), German (1976), Portuguese (1978).
- 1927.a.** "On Some Rules of Pāṇini". *JAOS* 47.61-70. — Repr. in 1970a:157-165, and in *A Reader on the Sanskrit Grammarians* ed. by J. F. Staal (Cambridge, Mass.; London: M.I.T. Press, 1972), 266-272.
- 1927.b.** "On Recent Work in General Linguistics". *MPh* 25.211-230. — Repr. in 1970a:173-190.
- 1927.c.** "Literate and Illiterate Speech". *AS* 2.432-439. — Repr. in *Language in Culture and Society* ed. by Dell Hymes (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), 391-396, and in 1970a:147-156.
- 1927.d.** "American English". *MPhon* III.5.40-42. Repr. in 1970a:192-194.
- 1927.e.** "Notes on the Fox Language". *IJAL* 3.181-219 [Sections IV-XI.]
- 1927.f.** "The Word-Stems of Central Algonquian". *Festschrift Meinhof: Beiträge zur afrikanischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin), 393-402. [Submitted (or received) May 20, 1926.] — Repr. in part in 1970a:138-140.
- 1927.g.** "What Symbols Shall We Use?" [with George M. Bolling]. *Lg* 2.123-129. — Repr. in 1970a:166-172.
- 1927.h.** Review of P[ater] Wilhelm Schmidt, S.V.D., *Die Sprachfamilien und Sprachkreise der Erde* (Heidelberg, Winter, 1926), *Lg* 3.130-131. — Repr. in 1970a:197-198.
- 1927.j.** Review of Otto Dempwolff, *Die L-, R- und D-Laute in austronesischen Sprachen* (Berlin: Sonderdruck aus der Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-sprachen, 1925). *Lg* 3.199.
- 1927.k.** Review of George Washington Salisbury Friedrichsen, *The Gothic Version of the Gospels: A Study in Style and Textual History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1926). *JEGP* 26.401-406.
- 1927.m.** Review of Otto Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Language* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1924). *JEGP* 26.444-446. — Repr. in 1970a:141-143.
- 1927.n.** Review of Karl Lokotsch, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der amerikanischen (indianischen) Wörter im Deutschen* (Heidelberg, Winter, 1926). *MPh* 24.489-491. — Repr. in 1970a:144-146.
- 1927.o.** Review of Friedrich Maurer, *Untersuchungen über die deutsche Verbstellung in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1926). *MPh* 24.491-493.
- 1927.p.** Notice of Erik Rooth, *Altgermanische Wortstudien* (Halle/S.: Max Niemeyer, 1926). *MPh* 24.500.
- 1928.a.** *Menomini Texts*. New York: American Ethnological Society (G. E. Stechert & Co., agents); xiv, 607 pp. [Bulk of manuscript completed and

- probably submitted before mid-1925.] — Preface repr. in part in 1970a:210–211
- i. R Truman Michelson, *Lg* 5.189–190 (1929).
- 1928.b. *First German Book*. 2nd ed. [of 1923]. New York & London: The Century Company; xiii, 397 pp.
- i. R Hans Kurath, *MLJ* 13.661–663 (May, 1929).
- 1928.c. “The Story of Bad Owl”. *A[22]CIA* 2.23–44. — Repr. in 1970a:199–209.
- 1928.d. “The Plains Cree Language”. *Ibid.* 427–431.
- 1928.e. “A Note on Sound Change”. *Lg* 4.99–100. — Repr. in 1970a:212–213.
- 1928.f. Review of Gerardus Gesinus Kloeke, *De Hollandsche expansie in de zestiende en zeventiende eeuw en haar weerspiegeling in de hedendagsche Nederlandsche Dialecten* (’s Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1927). *Lg* 4.284–288. — Repr. in 1970a:214–218.
- 1928.g. Review of Adolf Stender Petersen, *Slawisch-germanische Lehnwörterkunde: Eine Studie über die ältesten germanischen Lehnwörter im Slawischen in sprach- und kulturgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung* (Göteborg: Elanders, 1927). *JEGP* 27.396–398.
- 1928.h. Review of Marten Jan van der Meer, *Historische Grammatik der niederländischen Sprache*, 1. Band (Heidelberg: Winter, 1927). *JEGP* 27.550–551.
- 1928.j. Notice of Ludovic Grootaers & Gerardus Gesinus Kloeke, *Handleiding bij Nord- en Zuid-Nederlaansch dialektonderzoek* (’s Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1926). *MPh* 25.376.
- 1928.k. Notice of Erich Maschke, *Studien zu Waffennamen der althochdeutschen Glossen* (Greifswald: Adler, 1926). *MPh* 25.504–505.
- 1928.m. Notice of Werner Salow, *Die deutsche Sprachwissenschaft in der Allgemeinen Deutschen Bibliothek: Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Philologie im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Greifswald: Adler & Panzig, 1926). *MPh* 25.507.
- 1929.a. “Notes on the Preverb *ge-* in Alfredian English”. *Studies in Philology: A Miscellany in Honor of Frederick Klaeber* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press), 79–102.
- 1929.b. “Otfriidiana”. *JEGPh* 28.489–502.
- 1929.c. Review of Bruno Liebich, *Konkordanz Pāṇini — Candra* (Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1928). *Lg* 5.267–276. — Repr. in 1970a:219–228.
- 1929.d. Review of *Festskrift til Hjalmar Falk* (Oslo: Aschehoug [Nygaard], 1927). *MPh* 26.367–369. [With Archer Taylor.]
- 1929.e. Review of Helmut de Boer, *Untersuchungen zur Sprachbehandlung Otfrids: Hiatus und Synaloephe* (Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1929). *MPh* 27.221–224.
- 1929.f. Notice of Eduard Hartl, *Die Textgeschichte des Wolframschen Parzival*, 1. Teil (Berlin & Leipzig: W. de Gruyter, 1928). *MPh* 27.373.

- 1930.a.** *Sacred Stories of the Sweet Grass Cree*. (= National Museum of Canada, Bulletin no. 60: *Anthropological Series*, no. 11.) Ottawa: Government Printing Bureau.
- 1930.b.** "Salic litus". *Studies in Honor of Hermann Collitz* (Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins Press), 83-94.
- 1930.c.** "OHG *eino*, OE *ana* 'solus'". *Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies* (Baltimore, Maryland: Linguistic Society of America), 50-59.
- 1930.d.** "Old English Plural Subjunctives in -e". *JEGP* 29.100-113.
- 1930.e.** "German *ç* and *x*". *MPhon* III.20.27-28. — Repr. in 1970a:195.
- 1930.f.** "Linguistics as a Science". *Studies in Philology* 27.553-557. — Repr. in 1970a:231-236.
- 1931.a.** "Albert Paul Weiss" [Obituary]. *Lg* 7.219-221. — Repr. in 1970a:237-239.
- 1931.b.** Review of John Ries, *Was ist ein Satz?* (Prag: Taussig & Taussig, 1931). *Lg* 7.204-209. — Repr. in 1970a:231-236.
- 1931.c.** Review of Virgil Moser, *Frühneuhochdeutsche Grammatik*, 1. Band (Heidelberg: Winter, 1929). *JEGP* 30.407-408.
- 1932.a.** "The Word". *MPhon* III.38.41. — Repr. in 1970a:196.
- 1932.b.** Review of Eduard Hermann, *Lautgesetz und Analogie* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1931). *Lg* 8.230-233. Repr. in 1970a:240-251.
- 1933.a.** *Language*. New York: Henry Holt & Co. ix, 564 pp. [British ed., London: Allen & Unwin, 1935; many later printings.]
- i. R Franklin Edgerton, *JAOS* 53.295-297 (1933).
 - ii. R Samuel Kroesch, *JEGP* 32.594-597 (1933).
 - iii. R Charles F. Voegelin, *MPhon* III.43-53 (1933), with added note by Daniel Jones.
 - iv. R Antoine Meillet, *BSLP* 34:3.1-2 (1933).
 - v. R Edgar Howard Sturtevant, *CW* 27.159-163 (March 26, 1934).
 - vi. R Roland Grubb Kent, *Lg* 10.40-48 (1934), with added note by George Melville Bolling (48-51).
 - vii. R Albert Debrunner, *IF* 54.148-149 (1935).
- For later reprints, cf. 1935a; 1965; 1984.
- Translations: Chinese, 1988; French, 1970b; Italian, 1970c; Japanese, 1959 (in part), 1962; Spanish, 1940b, 1964a.
- 1933.b.** "The Structure of Learned Words". *A Commemorative Volume Issued by the Institute for Research on English Teaching on the Occasion of the Tenth Annual Conference of English Teachers* (Tokyo), 17-23. — Repr. in *The English Language* ed. by W. F. Bolton & David Crystal (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1969), vol.II, 157-162, and in 1970a:252-256.
- 1934.a.** *Plains Cree Texts*. New York: American Ethnological Society (G. E. Stechert & Co., agents). vii, 309 pp.
- i. R David Mandelbaum, *AmA* NS.38.114-115 (1936).
- 1934.b.** "A Note on Transcription". *MPhon* III.46.54. — Repr. in 1970a:196.

- 1934.c.** Review of Wilhelm Havers, *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax: Ein Versuch zur Entstehung der Bedingungen und Triebkräfte in Syntax und Stilistik* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1931). *Lg* 10.32-40. — Repr. in 1970a:280-288.
- 1934.d.** Review of Georg Pilhofer, *Grammatik der Kâte-Sprache in Neu-guinea* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1933). *Lg* 10.63-64.
- 1935.a.** *Language*. London: George Allen & Unwin. ix, 566 pp. [British English version of 1933a.]
- i.** R George Melville Bolling, *Lg* 11.251-252 (1935).
- 1935.b.** "The Stressed Vowels of American English". *Lg* 11.97-115. — Repr. in 1970a:289-306.
- 1935.c.** "Linguistic Aspects of Science". *Philosophy of Science* 2.499-517. — Repr. in 1970a:307-321.
- 1936.a.** "On Laves' Review of Dempwolff". *Lg* 12.52-53.
- 1936.b.** "Language or Ideas?". *Lg* 12.89-92. — Repr. in 1970a:322-328.
- 1936.c.** Review of Arthur F. Bentley, *Linguistic Analysis of Mathematics* (Bloomington, Indiana: The Principia Press, 1932) and *Behavior, Knowledge, Fact* (Ibid., 1935). *Lg* 12.137-141. — Repr. in 1970a:329-332.
- 1937.a.** "Notes on Germanic Compounds". *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à M. Holger Pedersen* (Aarhus: Universitets Forlaget), 303-307.
- 1937.b.** "The Language of Science". Manuscript, published in part in 1970a: 333-338.
- 1938.a.** "Initial [k] in German". *Lg* 14.178-186. — Repr. in 1970a:349-346.
- 1938.b.** "Eduard Prokosch" [Obituary]. *Lg* 14.310-313. — Repr. in 1970a: 347-350.
- 1938.c.** Review of Roger Williams, *A Key into the Language of America*, 5th ed. (Providence, R.I.: Rhode Island & Providence Plantations Tercentenary Committee, 1936). *New England Quarterly* 11.416-418.
- 1939.a.** *Linguistic Aspects of Science* (= *International Encyclopaedia of Unified Science* 1:4; ninth impression, 1965). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. viii, 59 pp. — Excerpt repr. in 1970a:363-364.
- i.** R E[rnest] N[agel], *Journal of Philosophy* 36.61 (1940).
- ii.** R James W. Wilson, *Lg* 16.347-351 (1940).
- For Italian translation, cf. 1970d, 1982.
- 1939.b.** "Menomini Morphophonemics". *Études phonologiques dédiées à la mémoire de N. S. Troubetzkoy* (= *TCLP* 8), 105-115. Prague. — Repr. in 1970a:351-362.
- 1939.c.** Review of Louis H. Gray, *Foundations of Language* (New York: Macmillan, 1939). *MLJ* 24.198-199. — Repr. in 1970a:365-366.
- 1940.a.** *El lenguaje*. Versión autorizada del Dr. Norman A. McQuown y Adrián F. León. Edición mimeográfica provisoria. México, Escuela Nacional de Antropología (Biblioteca). Paginated by chapters. [Copy deposited and catalogued in aforementioned Library. Revised edition in progress (1989).]

- 1940.b.** *Teaching Children to Read*. Reproduced in dittographed form from type-script. © Leonard Bloomfield. [Story "The picture country" repr. in 1970a:377-383.]
- 1941.a.** "Ideals and Idealists". *Lg* 17.39. [Reply to 1939.a.iii.]
- 1941.b.** "Proto-Algonquian -i-t- 'fellow'." *Lg* 17.292-297.
- 1941.c.** Review of Morice Vanoverbergh, *Some Undescribed Languages of Luzon* (Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vogt, 1937). *Acta Linguistica* 2.129.
- 1942.a.** *Outline Guide for the Practical Study of Foreign Languages*. Baltimore, Maryland: Linguistic Society of America. 16 pp.
- i. R Edgar H[oward] Sturtevant, *Lg* 19.42-44 (1943).
- ii. R John F[lagg] Gummere, *CW* 30.238 (1943).
- iii. R Murray B[arnson] Emeneau, *JAOS* 63.208-209 (1943).
- 1942.b.** [First draft of §4.8 and all but the first section of Chapter 5.] *Outline of Linguistic Analysis* by Bernard Bloch and George L. Trager (Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America), 82 pp.
- 1942.c.** "Philosophical Aspects of Language". *Studies in the History of Culture: The Disciplines of the Humanities (presented to Waldo G. Leland)* (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta), 172-177. — Repr. in 1970a:396-399.
- 1942.d.** "Linguistics and Reading". *Elementary English Review* 19.125-130, 182-186. — Repr. in 1970a:384-395.
- 1942.e.** "Outline of Ilocano Syntax". *Lg* 18.193-200. — Repr. in *Syntactic Theory I: Structuralist* ed. by Fred W. Householder, Jr. (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 93-102).
- 1943.a.** "Meaning". *Monatshefte* 35.101-106. Repr. in 1970a:400-405.
- 1943.b.** "Franz Boas" [Obituary]. *Lg* 19.198. — Repr. in 1970a:408-409.
- 1943.c.** Review of Mauricio Swadesh, *La nueva filología* (México: El Nacional, 1941). *Lg* 19.168-170. — Repr. in 1970a:406-407.
- 1944.a.** *Colloquial Dutch*. New York: Henry Holt & Co. ix, 284 pp. [Also as War Department Education Manual EM550 (Washington, D.C.: published by the United States Armed Forces Institute, by the Linguistic Society of America and the American Council of Learned Societies).
- 1944.b.** *Spoken Dutch: Basic Course*. Vol. 1, Units I-XII. Ibid. x, 1-236 pp. [Also as War Department Education Manual EM529 (Washington, D.C.: imprint as for 1944a.)]
- 1944.c.** "Secondary and Tertiary Responses to Language". *Lg* 30.45-55. — Repr. in part in *Readings in Applied English Linguistics* ed. by Harold B. Allen (1st ed., 1953, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts), 195-202 (2nd ed., *ibid.*, 1964), and in full in 1970a:413-425.
- 1944.d.** Review of Frederick Bodmer, *The Loom of Language* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1944). *AS* 19.211-213. — Repr. in 1970a:410-412.
- 1945.a.** *Spoken Dutch: Basic Course*. Vol. 2. Units XIII-XXX. New York: Henry Holt & Co. [iv], 237-554 pp. [Also as War Department Education Manual EM530 (Washington, D.C.); imprint as for 1944a.]

- 1945.b.** *Handleiding voor de Gids* [for 1944b, 1945a]. War Department Education Manual EM531; imprint as for 1944a.]
- 1945.c.** [with Luba Petrova] *Spoken Russian: Basic Course*, Vol. 2. Units XIII–XXX. New York: Henry Holt & Co. [xi,] 301-698 pp. [Bloomfield also did much of the original work, with Luba Petrova and others, on *Spoken Russian*, Vol. 1 (Units I–XIII), but refused to allow his name to appear on it.]
- 1945.d.** “Grammatical Introduction” [unsigned]. *Dictionary of Spoken Russian*, Part II: *Russian–English* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. War Department as its Technical Manual TM 30-944).
- 1945.e.** “About Foreign Language Teaching”. *Yale Review* 34.625-641. — Repr. in 1970a:426-438.
- 1945.f.** “On Describing Inflection”. *Monatshefte* 37:4/5.8-13. — [Excerpt (two paragraphs) repr. in 1970a:439.]
- 1946.a.** *Spravčnik Rukoveditelä dlä / Spoken Russian*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. War Department (War Department Education Manual EM526; imprint as for 1944a).
- 1946.b.** “Algonquian”. *Linguistic Structures of Native America* by Harry Hoijer et al (New York: Viking Fund), 85-129. — Repr. in 1970a:440-488.
- 1946.c.** “Twenty-One Years of the Linguistic Society”. *Lg* 22.1-3. — Repr. in 1970a:491-494.

POSTHUMOUS PUBLICATIONS AND REPRINTS

Separate listings are given only for items whose bibliographical data differ significantly from those of the original publications; otherwise, under the year of reprinting, reference is given to the first year of publication in the preceding list.

1949. — cf. 1926.
- 1957.** *Eastern Ojibwa: Grammatical Sketch, Texts, and Word List*. Ed. by Charles F. Hockett. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press. x, 271 pp.
- i. R Robert H[enry]Robins, *ArchL* 10.170-172 (1958).
- ii. R C[hables] F[rederick] Voegelin, *Lg* 25.109-125 (1959).
- iii. R O[lga] S[ergeevna] Akhmanova, *VJa* 1959:3.125-127.
1957. — cf. also 1926.
- 1958.** *Gengo to kagaku*. Tokyo: Taishukan. vii, 120 pp. [Annotated original text of 1949a, with Japanese translation by Tsugiyoshi Torii.]
1958. — cf. also 1944c.
- 1959.** *Gengo*. 2 vols. Tokyo: Kenkyusha. Vol. 1: v, 119 pp. Vol. 2: iv, 220 pp. [Japanese translation (abridged) of 1933a: vol. 1 by Yasuo Isami; vol. 2 by Setsuo Masuyama.]

1959. "Gengo no kagaku no ta me no kojunshu". *Kozo-gengogaku*, 27-42. Tokyo: Tarumi-shobo. [Japanese translation of 1926 by Toshio Gunji.]
1961. *Let's Read* [with Clarence L. Barnhart]. Detroit: Wayne State University Press. 465 pp. [Ed. by Barnhart of 1940 type-script.]
- i. R Yakov Malkiel, *RomPh* 16.84-91 (1962/63).
 - ii. R Henry Lee Smith Jr., *Lg* 39.67-78 (1963).
 - iii. R V[ilém] Fried, *PhP* 7.318-320 (1963).
 - iv. R Ju[r]ij B. Elissenko, "Experimental'nyi uchebni L. Blumfilda", *IJaS* 1963:6.105-108.
1962. *The Menomini Language*. Ed. Charles F. Hockett. New Haven & London: Yale University Press. xi, 515 pp. [Excerpt repr. in 1970a:489-490.]
- i. R Wallace L. Chafe, *AmA* NS.67.1016-1017 (1965).
 - ii. R Karl V[an Dijn] Teeter, *Lg* 46.524-533 (1970).
 - iii. R Karl V. Teeter, *IJAL* 36.235-239 (1970).
1962. *Gengo*. Tokyo: Taishukan. [Japanese translation by Koh Miyake and Yoshizumi Hino.]
1964. *Lenguaje*. Lima (Perú): Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Departamento de Publicaciones. xxiii, 694 pp. [Translation by Alberto Escobar, with "Prólogo a la Edición en español" (vii-xviii) and "Bibliografía básica complementaria" (668-661).]
- i. R Aryon D. Rodrigues, *Estudios Lingüísticos* 1:2.74-75
- 1964 — cf. also 1940a.
1965. *Language History*. [= Chapters 17-27 of 1933a, ed. by Harry Hoijer, with updated notes]. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. vii, 281-512 pp.
- i. N Yakov Malkiel, *RomPh* 20.149 (1960/61).
- 1967.a. *Language*. London: George Allen & Unwin. ix, 566 pp. [Repr. of 1935a.]
- i. R Klaus Baumgärtner, *ASNS* 207.113-118 (1970/71).
- 1967.b. *Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis and Translation*. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation. 408 pp. [Repr. of 1917.]
- 1969 — cf. 1932b.
- 1970.a. *A Leonard Bloomfield Anthology*. Ed. Charles F. Hockett. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press. xxxi, 533 pp.
- i. R Harry Hoijer, *Lg* 47.911-913 (1971).
 - ii. R Giulio C[iro] Lepšy, *Linguistics* 108.120-128 (1973).
 - iii. R Zellig S[abbetai] Harris, *IJAL* 39.251-255 (1973).
- 1970.b. *Le langage*. Paris: Payot. xxx, 523 pp. [Translation of 1933a by Janick Gazio, with preface by Frédéric François.]
- i. R Eddy Roulet, *BCILA* 12.57-58 (1970).
 - i. R Maurice Leroy, *RPh* 49.626-628 (1971).
 - iii. R André Boudreau, *Kranylos* 16.210-212 (1971).
- 1970.c. *Il linguaggio*. Milano: Il Saggiatore. vi, 627 pp. [Translation of 1933a by Francesco Antinucci and Giorgio Raimondo Cardona.]
- i. R L. Silva, *LeSt* 6.108 (1971).

- 1970.d.** *Scienza del linguaggio e linguaggio della scienza*. Pàdova: Marsilio. 79 pp. [Translation of 1939a by Bruna Giacomini.]
- i.** N Giuseppe Carlo Vincenzi, *LeSt* 6.168 (1971).
- 1972.** "The Original Preface to *Linguistic Structures of Native America*" *IJAL* 38.265-266. [With introduction by Ives Goddard.]
- 1972 — cf. also 1927a.
- 1973.** "Un ensemble de postulats pour la science du langage". *Genèse de la pensée linguistique* ed. by André Jacob, with the assistance of Pierre Caussat and Robert Nadeau (Paris: Armand Colin), 184-196.
- 1975.** *Menomini Lexicon* Ed. by Charles F. Hockett. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Milwaukee Museum Press. xviii, 480 pp.
- i.** N W[illiam] B[right], *Lg* 53.258 (1977).
- ii.** R Kenneth L. Miner, *IJAL* 43.66-73 (1977).
- 1978.** "Eine Grundlegung der Sprachwissenschaft in Definitionen und Annahmen". *Beschreibungsmethoden des amerikanischen Strukturalismus* ed. by Elisabeth Bense, Peter Eisenberg and Hartmut Haberland (München: Huber), 36-48. [Translation by Bernd Wiese of 1926.]
- 1978.a.** "Un conjunto de postulados para a ciência da linguagem". *Concepções gerais da teoria da lingüística* ed. by Marcelo Dascal (Sao Paulo: Global Editora e Distribuidora), 45-60. [Translation of 1926 by Ligia M. Cavallari.]
- 1978.b.** *Spoken Dutch*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Spoken Language Services. ix, 554 pp. [Repr. of 1944b, 1945a.]
- 1982.** *Scienza del linguaggio e linguaggio della scienza*. Seconda edizione (= *Saggi*, 81). Pàdova: Marsilio. 124 pp. [Second, amplified ed. of 1970d.]
- 1983.** *An Introduction to the Study of Language*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins. xxxviii, 335 pp. [Repr. of 1914a, ed. by E. F. K. Koerner, with photograph (vii), "Foreword" by Koerner (ix-xvi), "Introduction" by Joseph F. Kess (xvii-xxxiv) and "References" thereto (xxxiv-xxxviii).]
- i.** N M. Martinelli, *Linguisticae Investigationes* 7.437 (1983).
- ii.** R Robert A. Hall, Jr., *HL* 10.320-324 (1983).
- iii.** R William G. Moulton, *CJL* 29.201-207 (1984).
- 1984.** *Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. xvi, 564 pp. [Repr. of 1933a, with "Foreword" by Charles F. Hockett (ix-xiv).]
- 1985.** *Yuyanlun* ["On Language"]. Beijing: Shangwu Yinshuguan ["Commercial Press"]. [Chinese translation of 1955, by Yuan Jighua, Zhao Shikai and Gan Shifu.— Omits notes, bibliography, table of contents and index of original; includes Bloomfield's prefaces to 1933 and 1935, and two brief forewords.]
- 1987.** *A Leonard Bloomfield Anthology*. Abridged edition. Ed. by Charles F. Hockett. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press. x, 314 pp. [Abridged version of 1970a.]

INDEX OF BIOGRAPHICAL NAMES

A.

Abdul (dog): 31
 Addlepate, Erasmus J. (pseudonym):
 81
 Adler, Mortimer J. (b.1900): 57, 81
 Allen, Philip Schuyler (1872-1937):
 39
 Andrade, Manuel J. (1885-1942): 58-
 59
 Aristarchus (ca. 220-143 B.C.): 24
 Arnauld, Antoine (1612-1694): 92

B.

Bach, Johann Sebastian (1685-1750):
 15
 Bally, Charles (1865-1947): 28
 Barnhart, Clarence L. (b.1900): 88
 B rtoli, Matteo Giulio (1873-1946):
 78-79
 Bennison, Barbara: 27-28
 Blake, Frank Ringgold (1875-1962):
 16, 17-18
 Bloch, Bernard (1907-1965): 48, 57,
 69, 74, 77, 82, 83-84, 90
 Bloomfield, Alice Sayers: 4, 9, 19,
 25, 30-31, 52-55, 64, 67, 79, 83,
 84, 87
 Bloomfield, Carola Buber: 3, 4
 Bloomfield, Grover: 5-6, 19, 26
 Bloomfield, James Sheldon: 36, 54,
 87
 Bloomfield, Leonard:
 Achievements: 15, 46-91
 Artistic ability: 6, 36
 Birth: 3

Death: 83-84
 Dogs: 31, 54
 Education
 Elementary: 5-6
 Graduate: 7-9
 High School: 6
 Undergraduate: 6-7
 English, command of: 7, 40-41
 Family: 3-6, 35-36
 Field-work: 19-20, 30, 46
 Grammar, attitude toward: 51
 Humor, sense of: 31-34, 70-71, 76-
 77, 80-82
 Marriage: 9
 Personality: 5, 15, 25, 30, 39-40,
 51, 52, 56-57, 63, 74, 79, 84
 Polemics, attitude towards: 57, 77
 Rank, academic: 13, 23, 39, 60
 Reading-materials: 6, 36, 50-51,
 88-89
 Religion, attitude towards: 4-5
 "Small mythologies": 32-34, 76-77,
 80-81
 Bloomfield, Marie (1904-1923): 5,
 19, 26, 27, 56, 87
 Bloomfield, Maurice (1855-1928): 3,
 9, 15-16, 27, 30
 Bloomfield, Roger Montour: 36, 51-
 52, 54, 87
 Bloomfield, Sigmund: 3, 4, 19
 Bobrinskoy, George V. (1907-1974):
 58-59
 Bolling, George Melville (1871-
 1963): 23-24, 25, 42, 44, 71, 90
 Bonfante, Giuliano (b.1904): 78
 Borgese, Giuseppe Antonio (1882-

1952): 57-58
 Boucher, Chauncey S. (1886-1955): 57
 Brahms, Johannes (1833-1896): 5, 15
 Brugmann, Karl (1849-1919): 15
 Brumbaugh, Dean: 41-42
 Buber, Martin (1865-1925): 3
 Buber, Wolle: 33-34
 Buck, Carl Darling (1866-1955): 8, 27, 39, 58-59

C.

Capone, Alphonse (1895-1947): 39
 Cassidy, Frederic Gomes (b.1907): 89
 Cassirer, Ernst (1874-1945): 49
 Chomsky, Avram Noam (b.1928): 90-92
 Cióffari, Vincenzo (b.1905): 72, 73
 "Clapp, Sally": 76-77, 80-81
 Collitz, Hermann (1855-1935): 27
 Copeland, Charles Townsend (1860-1952): 7
 Confucius (ca.555- ca 429 B.C.): 42
 Cornyn, William Stewart (1906-1971): 73, 82
 Cowan, J Milton (b.1907): 28, 33, 43, 63-64, 71-74, 78, 80-81

D.

Dempwolff, Otto (1871-1938): 50
 Després, Léon (b.1908): 4, 5-6, 8, 26, 30, 40, 52, 53, 56, 70n, 87
 Doyle, Sir Arthur Conan (1853-1930): 3

E.

Edgerton, Franklin (1885-1967): 70, 75, 82

Erickson, Caroline Amanda (b.1945): 83n
 Esper, Erwin Allen (1895-1972): 24-26, 31
 Evans, Marshall Blakemore (1874-1955): 23

F.

Filbey, Emery Thomas: 59-60
 Finn, Huck: 35
 Fries, Charles Carpenter (1887-1967): 44-45, 89, 90, 91

G.

Geary, James A. (1882-1960): 44
 Gedney, William John (b.1915): 68
 Gildersleeve, Virginia (1877-1965): 26
 Gilliéron, Jules (1854-1926): 46
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1749-1832): 8
 Goetze, Albrecht (1897-1971): 69
 Goodenough, Erwin (1893-1965): 84, 97
 "Goodie" — see Bloomfield, Alice Sayers
 Graves, Frederick Mortimer (1893-1982): 71
 Gray, Barbara Bennison: 27-28
 Gray, J. Michael: 27-28
 Gray, William S. (1885-1960): 50
 Grimm, Jacob (1785-1863): 47
 Gumbin, Mr. and Mrs.: 35
 Gummere, John Flagg (b.1901): 77

H.

Haas, Mary Rosamond (b.1910): 72, 78
 Haessler, Carl: 20
 Hahn, Emma Adelaide (1893-1967): 69, 70, 79)
 Hall, Frances Adkins (1903-1975):

31, 54-55, 69, 70
 Hall, Robert Anderson, Jr. (b.1911):
 5, 8, 19, 19-30, 31, 48-49, 51, 53-
 56, 57, 68, 75, 78, 82-83, 89-90
 Hanley, Miles (1893-1954): 57
 Harris, Zellig Sabbetai (b.1909): 48,
 91
 Hauptmann, Gerhart (1862-1946): 9
 Heine, Heinrich (1797-1856): 42
 Hermann, Eduard (1889-1950): 43-
 44
 Hitler, Adolf (1889-1945): 56
 Hockett, Charles Francis (b.1916):
 46, 57, 78, 83, 88
 Hoenigswald, Henry Max (b.1915):
 69
 Hohlfeld, Alexander R. (1865-1935):
 8
 Hoiijer, Harry (1904-1976): 50, 58-59
 Humboldt, Wilhelm von (1767-
 1835): 29, 92
 Hutchins, Robert Maynard (1899-
 1977): 57-64

J.

Jakobson, Román (1896-1982): 69,
 76, 83
 Jespersen, Otto (1860-1943): 49, 89
 Joos, Martin (1907-1978): 3, 27, 77,
 92
 Jorden, Eleanor Harz: 74

K.

Kellogg, Robert J.: 71
 Keniston, Hayward (1883-1970):
 57n, 58-59, 63-64
 Kent, Roland Grubb (1877-1952):
 27, 71
 Kloeke, Gerardus Gesinus (1877-
 1964): 43, 46
 Kunstmann, John (1895-1989): 52-
 53
 Kurath, Hans (b.1891): 39, 59

L.

Lancelot, Claude (1615-1695): 92
 Laves, Gerhard: 50
 Leskien, August (1840-1916): 8, 15
 Leslau, Wolf (b.1906): 69
 "Lesnin, Ignatius Mendeleeff": 76-77,
 80-81
 Liebich, Bruno (1862-1939): 43
 Lotspeich, Claude Meek (1880-1966):
 13

M.

Malkiel, Yakov (b.1914): 88
 Marx, Karl (1818-1883): 56
 Mason, Max (1877-1967): 57
 McDavid, Raven Ioor, Jr. (1911-
 1984): 90
 McKenzie, Kenneth (1870-1949): 19,
 67
 McKeon, Richard Patrick (1900-
 1985): 59-64, 78, 87
 Metcalf, George Joseph (b.1908): 52-
 53
 Meyer, Max (1872-1967): 24
 Michelson, Truman (1879-1938): 16,
 20, 70-71
 Moulton, Jenni Karding: 30, 74
 Moulton, William Gamwell (b.1914):
 13, 30, 46, 67-68, 74, 79
 Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus (1756-
 1791): 15
 Müller, Friedrich Max (1823-1900):
 29
 Mussolini, Benito (1883-1945): 67

N.

Nitze, William Albert (1876-1957):
 58n

O.

Ogden, Charles Kay (1887-1957): 49

Oldenberg, Hermann (1854-1920): 16
 Oppenheim, Claire Després: 70n
 O'Reilly, Georgia: 54
 O'Reilly, Michael: 54
 O'Reilly, Patricia: 54
 O'Reilly, William F.: 7, 54, 55-56
 Otfid (9th c. A.D.): 79

P.

Pāṇini (c. 6th cent. B.C.): 16, 43, 45
 Parmenter, Clarence Edward (1888-1982): 58-59, 63-64
 Paul, Hermann (1846-1921): 47
 Petersen, Walter (1881-1939): 71
 Petrova, Luba: 76
 Petrunkevich, Aleksandr Ivanovich (1893-1979): 75
 Pike, Kenneth Lee (b.1912): 48
 Pisistratus (6th c. B.C.): 24
 Plato (428-339 B.C.): 42
 Preveden, Francis R.: 71
 Prokosch, Eduard (1876-1938): 8, 25, 67

Q.

"Queen Goodall" — see Bloomfield, Alice Sayers

R.

Richards, Ivor Armstrong (1893-1979): 49
 Riedlinger, Albert (1883-1978): 28
 Roedder, Edwin G. (1873-1945): 8
 Rosenthal, Moritz (1862-1946): 3

S.

Sachs, Hans (1494-1576): 13
 Santiago, Antonio Viola: 17
 Sapir, Edward (1884-1939): 4, 23, 26, 28, 30, 32, 41, 46, 47, 70-71, 89, 92

Saussure, Ferdinand de (1857-1913): 14, 28, 45, 46, 78-79, 89
 Sayers, Alfred: 20
 Sayers, Alice: 8
 Sayers, Chandor: 8
 Sayers, Mrs. Chandor: 26
 Sayers, Frances Clarke (1898-1989): 29, 30-36, 79, 87
 Schiller, Friedrich von (1759-1805): 55
 Schütze, Martin (1866-1950): 8, 39
 Secheyay, Charles Albert (1870-1946): 28
 Shakespeare, William (1564-1616): 6, 54
 Smith, Henry Lee, Jr. (1913-1972): 79, 88-89, 96
 Spitzer, Leo (1887-1960): 27-28, 77
 Steinthal, Heymann (1823-1899): 29
 Storm, Theodor (1817-1888): 55
 Sturtevant, Edgar Howard (1875-1952): 27, 52, 70, 75, 82
 Sumner, William Graham (1840-1910): 81
 Swadesh, Morris (1909-1967): 73, 75-76

T.

Tacitus, Publius Cornelius (ca. 55-120 A.D.): 7
 Taylor, Archer (1890-1973): 58
 Tolkien, John Ronald Reuel (1892-1973): 82-83
 Trager, George Leonard (b.1906): 40, 69, 74, 75-76, 90
 Treviño, Salomón Narciso (1897-1983): 73
 Trubetzkoy, Nikolaj Sergeevich (1890-1938): 50
 Twaddell, William Freeman (1906-1982): 90
 Vendryès, Joseph (1875-1960): 45-46, 83

"Vestry the Lynx" — see Bloomfield,
Leonard, "Small mythologies"
Voegelin, Charles Frederick ("Carl"),
1906-1986): 39, 91
Voegelin, Florence Margaret (1927-
1989): 91

W.

Wackernagel, Jacob (1853-1938): 16
Watson, John Broadus (1878-1958):
34, 46
Weiss, Albert Paul (1879-1931): 23-
26
Weiss, Mrs. Albert P.: 25-26
Whitney, William Dwight (1827-
1894): 29, 92
Whittier, John Greenleaf (1807-
1892): 87

Whorf, Benjamin Lee (1897-1941):
69
Wiener, Leo (1862-1933): 19
Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1889-1951):
26
Wolff, John Ulrich (b.1932): 17
Wood, Francis Asbury (1859-1948):
8, 39
Wordsworth, William (1770-1850):
41
Wundt, Wilhelm (1832-1920): 14-15,
18, 24

Z.

Zeisler, Ernest Bloomfield: 3
Zeisler, Fannie Bloomfield (1863-
1927): 3
Zimmermann, Sally: 70n

INDEX OF SUBJECTS, TERMS, AND LANGUAGES

A.

Ablaut (Germanic secondary): 8
 American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS): 71-73
 American Philological Association: 18
 Ann Arbor (Michigan): 52, 89
 "Arabico-Gothic culture": 18-19
 Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP): 72-75, 77-78
 Association of American Universities: 78
Athetized Lines of the Iliad, The (G. M. Bolling): 24
 Austria: 3, 56

B.

"Behaviorism": 24, 90
 Bielitz (Austria) = Bielsko (Poland): 3
 Brooklyn (N.Y.): 19n

C.

Chanson de Roland, La: 23
Charakteristik der hauptsächlichsten Typen des Sprachbaues (H. Steinthal): 29
 Chicago (Illinois): 3, 5, 6, 7-8, 9, 39-64, 67, 87
 Cincinnati (Ohio): 13
Colloquial Dutch (L. Bloomfield): 73
 Columbus (Ohio): 19, 23-36
Commentary to the Germanic Law and Mediaeval Documents (L. Wiener): 18-19
 Copenhagen (Denmark): 69

"Corsssett" (imaginary language): 82
Cours de linguistique générale (F. de Saussure): 14, 28, 46, 78-79
 Cree (Amerindian tribe): 23

D.

Dialectology: 42, 43, 45, 50, 67-68, 78

E.

Elkhart Lake (Wisconsin): 2, 4-6, 19, 20
 Ethnology: 14
 Europe: 23
External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer (G. M. Bolling): 24

F.

Faust (J. W. von Goethe): 8
First German Book (L. Bloomfield): 19, 30, 45
Folkways (W. G. Sumner): 81

G.

Germany: 13-14, 15-16, 56, 71
 Göttingen (Germany): 14, 16
Grammaire générale et raisonnée (A. Arnauld & C. Lancelot): 92
 Grammar, traditional: 51
 Grammarians, Indic: 16, 17
 Gypsies: 29-30

H.

- Hadassah: 4
 Hague, The (Netherlands): 23
Hamburg Avenue (Brooklyn, N.Y.): 19n
 Haymarket riots (1866-1867): 3
 Heath, D.C., Publisher (Boston, Mass.): 73-74, 91
 “-heimer-language”: 82-83
 History: 14
Hollandsche expansie in de zestiende en zeven-tiende eeuw en haar weer-spiegeling in de hedendaagsche Nederlandsche dialecten, De (G. G. Kloeke): 43
 Holmes, Sherlock (stories concerning): 3
 Holt, Henry, Publisher (New York, N.Y.): 13-14, 44, 73-74
 Homer: 23-24
 Hotel Schwartz (Elkhart Lake, Wisconsin): 2, 4, 9, 19
 Hotel Taft (New Haven, Connecticut): 67, 79
How To Read A Book (M. J. Adler): 81
How To Read Two Books (“E. J. Addlepatte”): 81

I.

- Idiolect: 49
Iliad (Homer): 23-24
Ilias Atheniensium (G. M. Bolling): 24
Immensee (T. Storm): 55
 Intensive Language Program (ILP): 71-74
International Journal of American Linguistics: 29
 International Phonetic Alphabet: 46
Introduction to the Study of Language (L. Bloomfield): 9, 13-15, 16, 44

J.

- Judaism: 3-4, 35, 40
 “Junggrammatiker” — see Sound-change

L.

- Language, teaching of: 14, 15, 55-56, 71-76
Language (E. Sapir): 28
Language (L. Bloomfield): 3-4, 6, 14, 19-30, 35, 41, 43, 44-49, 50-51, 78-79, 81-82, 88, 89-90
Language (O. Jespersen): 28
Language (journal): 25, 27-28, 43, 83, 88-89
Language and the Study of Language (W. D. Whitney): 29
 “Language or Ideas?” (L. Bloomfield): 43
 Languages (individual or families of):
 Algonquian: 18, 19-20, 28, 41, 44, 45, 47, 52, 68
 American Indian: 30, 46, 70-71, 72, 91
 Athabaskan: 47
 Bulgarian, Old: 7-8
 Burmese: 73
 Chinese: 78
 Cree: 20, 30, 44, 52, 88
 Dutch: 43, 46, 73, 74
 English: 3, 34, 45, 88-89, 91
 Fox: 20, 28, 44, 52, 71, 88
 French: 6, 41-42, 49, 73-74
 German:
 Middle High: 18
 Modern: 3, 6, 8, 13, 19, 23, 25, 30, 41-42, 46, 50, 52, 54-55, 74
 Old High: 79
 Germanic: 8, 28, 41, 49
 Gothic: 41, 42
 Greek: 6, 23-24
 Hebrew: 46

- Ilocano: 68-69
Imaginary: 82-83
Indic: 28, 29-30
Italian: 73, 75
Judeo-German: 4, 70
Indo-European: 18
Latin: 6, 51-91
Lithuanian: 7-8
Malayo-Polynesian: 17, 50, 68-69
Melanesian Pidgin
 English: 89-90
Menominee: 6, 18, 19-20, 25, 44, 52, 69, 88
Norse, Old: 41
Ojibwa: 20, 44, 52, 88
Plains Cree: 44
Portuguese: 73
Proto-Central Algonquian: 28, 44, 50
Romanian: 29-30
Roumanian: 48
Russian: 7-8, 74, 75-76, 89
Sanskrit: 7-8, 16, 70
Spanish: 41-42, 73-74, 80-81
Swampy Cree: 44
Tagalog: 16-18, 45, 50
Thai: 72, 73
Tok Pisin: 89-90
Yiddish: 3-4, 70
Lautgesetz und Analogie (E. Hermann): 43-44
Lectures on the Science of Language (F. Max Müller): 29
Leipzig (Germany): 14, 15-16
Let's Read (L. Bloomfield & C. L. Barnhart): 88-89
Liberty cabbage: 19n
Life and Growth of Language, The (W. D. Whitney): 29
Linguistic Aspects of Science (L. Bloomfield): 49
Linguistic atlases (United States and Canada; New England): 42
Linguistic Institute(s): 42, 52, 68
Linguistic Society of America: 9, 25, 27-28, 30, 42-43, 62, 69-70, 71-72, 74, 77, 89
Linguistic Structures of Native America (H. Hoijer et al.): 50
Linguistics, general: 8, 13, 14, 16, 18 and *passim*
Literature:
 General: 14
 German: 8, 9
M.
Madison (Wisconsin): 8
Mathematics: 24-25
Meaning: 8, 47-48, 78, 90, 91
Menominee (Amerindian tribe): 20, 26-27, 68
Menomini Language, The (L. Bloomfield): 88
Menomini Lexicon (L. Bloomfield): 88
"Menomini morphophonemics" (L. Bloomfield): 50
Menomini Texts (L. Bloomfield): 26, 28, 43
"Mentalism": 24, 422-43, 47, 49, 55, 71, 91
Methods in Structural Linguistics (Z. S. Harris): 90
Milwaukee (Wisconsin): 19
Modern Language Quarterly: 77
Modern Philology (journal): 7
N.
Naples (Italy): 35
Nashville (Tennessee): 70-71
"Neogrammarian hypothesis" — see Sound-change
"Neogrammarians": 16
New Guinea: 56
New Haven (Connecticut): 56, 64, 67-84
New York (N.Y.): 13-14, 26, 30,

69, 76

New York Times: 81

"Note on sound-change, A" (L. Bloomfield): 44

O.

"Objectivism": 24, 47

"Occam's razor": 47

Odyssey (Homer): 23

Ojibwa Texts (L. Bloomfield): 88

"On recent work in general linguistics" (L. Bloomfield): 29

Outline Guide for the Practical Study of Foreign Languages (L. Bloomfield): 74

Outline of Linguistic Analysis (B. Bloch & G. L. Trager): 74

P.

Pearl Harbor (Hawaii): 78

Philology:

General: 14, 17

Germanic: 8, 39, 41, 42, 50, 79

Indo-European: 3, 8, 13, 18, 19

Philosophy: 49, 57

Phonemics: 43, 46, 48, 49

Phonetics: 48, 49, 63-64

"Physicalism": 24

physigunkus (Middle High German): 18-19

Poland: 3, 18

"Post-Bloomfieldians": 90

Prague (Czechoslovakia): 69

Predicate: 18

Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte (H. Paul): 47

Providence (Rhode Island): 57, 69

Psychology: 14-15, 18, 24, 26, 92

Psychology of the Other-One, The (M. Meyer): 24

Puerto Rico: 7, 53-55

R.

[r] (German): 3

Religion: 3-5, 35, 46

Requiem (J. Brahms): 15

Romance Philology (journal): 88

Rome (Italy): 33, 34-35

S.

Sacred Stories of the Sweet Grass

Cree (L. Bloomfield): 43

Saint-Nectaire (France): 33-34

Saskatchewan (Canada): 23, 30

sauerkraut: 19n

School of Modern Oriental Languages and Civilizations: 68-69

Science: 4-5, 24-28, 29, 71, 91, 92

"Secondary and tertiary responses to language" (L. Bloomfield): 77

Semantics — see Meaning

Sentence: 19

"Set of postulates for the science of language, A" (L. Bloomfield): 29

"Small mythologies of Leonard Bloomfield, The" (F. C. Sayers): 30

Sound-change, regularity of: 3, 16, 42, 44, 46-47, 50, 92

Spoken Dutch (L. Bloomfield): 74

Spoken German (W. G. & J. K. Moulton): 30, 74

Spoken Italian (V. Cióffari): 72, 73

Spoken Russian (L. Bloomfield et al.): 74, 75-76, 83

Spoken Spanish (S. N. Treviño & M. Swadesh): 74, 80-91

Subject (grammatical term): 18

Symbols, phonetic: 46

Symphony no.4 (J. Brahms): 15

Syntactic structures (A. N. Chomsky): 90-91

T.

Tagdlog Texts with Grammatical Analysis (L. Bloomfield): 16-18, 45
 Teubner, B. G., Publisher (Leipzig, Germany): 14
Time (magazine): 78
 Transformational-generative grammar: 91-92
 Turkey: 77
 "Twenty-one years of the Linguistic Society" (L. Bloomfield): 51

U.

Über die Kawisprache (W. von Humboldt): 29
 United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI): 73-74
 Universities:
 Barnard College: 19, 26
 Brown: 69
 California: 58
 Catholic University of America: 44
 Chicago: 7-8, 9, 25, 28, 36, 39-64, 87
 Cincinnati: 9, 13
 Columbia: 19, 26
 Harvard: 6-7
 Illinois: 13-20, 67
 Iowa: 71
 Johns Hopkins ("The Hopkins"): 18, 27, 77)

Mexico: 56
 Michigan: 77
 Milwaukee-Downer College: 19
 North Carolina: 52, 68
 Ohio State: 19-20, 23-30, 39, 42
 Pennsylvania: 91
 Princeton: 78
 Puerto Rico: 54-56
 Urbana (Illinois): 18-20, 23
 Wisconsin: 7-8, 20
 Yale: 27, 58-64, 67-84

V.

Völkerpsychologie (W. Wundt): 14-15
Vor Sonnenaufgang (G. Hauptmann): 9

W.

Wars:
 — First World: 16, 19
 — Second World: 71, 77
 Washington (D.C.): 71, 72, 73, 75
 Wayne State University Press: 88
 "Why a Linguistic Society?" (L. Bloomfield): 27
Wilson Avenue (Brooklyn, N.Y.): 19n
Winter's Tale, The (W. Shakespeare): 6
 Word (term): 18